

AR3735




Presented to
The Library
of the
University of Toronto
by
James Stewart, Esq.

CA121
-55C21

page

Canada. Royal commission on broadcasting
Hearings. v. 17-19, 1956.

1957



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
University of Toronto

17
ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

BROADCASTING

HEARINGS

HELD AT

TORONTO, ONT.

June 1, 1956

v. 17

FRIDAY, JUNE 1, 1956

SUBMISSIONS BY:

OPERA FESTIVAL ASSOCIATION.

Mr. Richard S. VanValkenburg
Dr. Boyd Neel.
Mr. Herman Geiger-Torel.

NATIONAL RELIGIOUS ADVISORY COUNCIL OF C.B.C.

Rev. George Borneman
Rev. J.R. Mutchmor
Rev. C.V. Farmer
Rev. Father Lanphier

UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA.

Rev. Dr. Kenneth J. Beaton
Rev. Dr. E.E. Long

SOUTHAM PRESS LIMITED.

Mr. St. Clair Balfour Jr.

CANADIAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION.

Dr. Freda F. Waldon
Mr. Robert H. Blackburn
Miss Katherine Ball.
Mrs. John W. Falkner.
Mr. David Foley.
Mr. Wm. L. Graff.

ROYAL CONSERVATORY OF MUSIC.

Dr. Walter
Dr. Boyd Neel.

---On resuming at 10.00 A.M.:

SUBMISSION OF THE OPERA FESTIVAL
ASSOCIATION.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. Richard S. VanValkenburg.
Dr. Boyd Neel.
Mr. Herman Geiger-Torel.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we
will begin this morning's hearing with the presen-
tation from the Opera Festival Association. Mr.

VanValkenburg, Dr. Neel, and Mr. Geiger-Torel, do you mind coming up to these chairs?

We will begin, Mr. VanValkenburg, by marking your brief No. 115.

EXHIBIT NO. 115: Brief of The Opera Festival Association.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure that you were present earlier this week when we opened the sessions here in Toronto. Perhaps just for you and for the others present I should say a word about our procedure. Any brief can either be read, if it is relatively short, or summarized and spoken to, and if need be amplified by those presenting it. After that we do address questions from counsel and from the Commission themselves, for the purpose of bringing out facts and the full opinion of the witness. Necessarily you examine to some extent from opposite views, from the witness^y, but no one should read into that any suggestion that the Commission has reached any conclusion.

We will mark your brief Exhibit No. 115, and will you tell us about your Association, Mr. VanValkenburg, and also present the brief?

MR. VanVALKENBURG: Thank you, Mr. Fowler. I think I will just read the brief and eliminate the rather formal prologue to it here about our Letters Patent and some of our past history.

This Association in submitting this brief assumes that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation:

(a) Wishes to use its best efforts to develop, recognize, employ and retain Canadian talent in Canada;

(b) As a part of its programme and policy, wishes to provide entertainment leading to cultural development in the fields of drama, music, ballet and opera; and

(c) Recognizes the importance of the existing organizations in these fields both as essential factors to cultural development in Canada and as a source of talent for its production;

And that for the foregoing reasons the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation by employing under their own name organizations such as the Toronto Symphony Orchestra, the Mendelsohn Choir, the National Ballet of Canada, the Toronto Philharmonic Orchestra, and other similar organizations in other Canadian cities, gives support to and follows its programme and policy as above stated.

The Opera Festival Association of Toronto does therefore further submit to the Commissioners that, in reporting their findings and recommendations, they recommend:

1. That some of the radio and television opera broadcasts originating from Toronto should present the Opera Festival Company of this Association;

2. That the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should televise some or all of the productions of the Opera Festival

Company in each year and that, because musical preparation is then complete and stage movement can be readily adapted, (factors which represent considerable savings in expense), this should be done in each year immediately following the Annual Opera Festival;

3. That consultations take place between officials of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and this Association for the purpose of inquiring into more economical methods of producing opera broadcasts (both radio and television);

4. That a balance should be reached in dividing the origination of opera broadcasts (both radio and television) between Toronto and Montreal, having due regard to the talent (performers) and the ability to produce, (directors and other facilities, in the two cities; and finally

5. That in order to develop the opera public in Canada (which this Association believes at the present time to be relatively undeveloped and highly susceptible to adverse reaction), great care should be exercised by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and all others concerned in the choice of operatic material for broadcast purposes.

All of which is most respectfully submitted

by Opera Festival Association of Toronto.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to add anything to the brief at the present time, or shall we ask questions?

MR. VanVALKENBURG: I think we might say something about the Company in case the Commission does not know about the Company.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I would like you to amplify a little.

Mr. VanVALKENBURG: There have been many efforts in Canada to build an opera company, and the Opera Festival Company I think is unique inasmuch as it started at the lowest level, that is the training stage with students, and over a period of ten years has grown into a completely professional company. This has been done gradually and solidly with first-class training, and for the first few years the Company's performances, it was Opera School performances, school performances.

THE CHAIRMAN: You said it was a professional company, completely professional company, I think you said. Do you mean professional in terms of policy, not that the singers and actors are not dependent on this as their main source of livelihood, are they?

MR. VanVALKENBURG: Yes, the principals in our productions are all professional musicians.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Aren't they largely drawn from the Royal Conservatory of Music?

MR. VanVALKENBURG: No, I am glad you

brought that up, because it give us an opportunity to speak about it. In the first few years of the Festival performances, they were student performances. In 1950 the University was unable and unwilling to use their funds to underwrite a possible deficit for what could be considered entertainment, and at that time an association of public-minded citizens was formed to look after the administration of financing of the Opera Festival.

That was the first break-away from the University, and each year personnel was drawn less from the opera school, until about four years ago none of our principals were students at all, and at the present time students are used only in very minor parts, perhaps in the chorus or extras or things of that type of capacity.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Does that hold true also for the orchestra, because I recall at the start it was largely a student orchestra bolstered by some professional musicians.

MR. VanVALKENBURG: Yes, that was true at the time; it was largely due to circumstances, there were amateur students at that time following the war, and for several years now our orchestra has not included any students.

MR. GEIGER-TOREL: Some, but very few.

MR. VanVALKENBURG: In describing the Company I think I should mention also it is unique in that it does not use the star system. We have never imported a singer from the United States or

any other country for box office purposes. It is essentially a Canadian company, and if you look over the personnel list of performers, you will see it covers places from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and when we cast our operas we first look for Canadian talent. If no Canadian is found suitable and available, we may then import, but only for that reason, and not for box office; and I think that is perhaps unique on this Continent, I am not sure, in the profession. Most professional companies rely on big names to get their audiences.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the cases when you do in fact, because you need the best person for a certain role, import an American, let us say, you do not feature him in your advertising or anything of that nature?

MR. VanVALKENBURG: That has to be done as a matter of standard procedure. It is not done always to their complete satisfaction because we do not run on the star system, but I would say that the Company has built its repertoire not on big-name stars but on the integration of the dramatic qualities with the musical ones, and that gives our Company a character that is quite unique, and we find a similar one -- Dr. Neel will perhaps correct me on this -- you would need to go to the Sadler Wells Ballet Company in England -- they operate on the same principle. They use top English people for the most part, and they concentrate on that balance between dramatic and musical.

Therefore, this Company is not only a Canadian company, but it is a company with a distinct character. I think that is perhaps important in view of the request that we make here, of the C.B.C., and I would like to expand what the brief has said by adding that one of the great pities about our operation is that it is such an important -- such an expensive operation to take on tour. We will probably have to wait for Government grants before that can be done to any extent.

In the meantime, we have to go to great expense in the production and the rehearsal for a short season, and from our point of view it is a shame that all this initial expense is used in such a short season. We feel that in making the suggestion through you to C.B.C. that our Festival performances should be made, used, all through radio broadcasting and television broadcasting -- we feel that this is something that would help us very greatly in being publicized, and thus in building an audience in Canada for opera, and we feel also this would be an advantage to the C.B.C. for there would be a very considerable saving involved since all production costs and rehearsal costs have been gone into.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there anything you would like to add to that by way of preliminary before we go into questioning?

DR. NEEL: I do not think so, sir. I serve on the Board. That is my connection with it. I have not any practical connection, shall we say.

I was two years with the Sadler Wells Company in London, and I would like to say here how excellent and how surprised I was to find the excellence of the performances here in Toronto when I came out here, and nobody had told me about this Opera Company, and the first time I attended a performance I was astonished by the standard they had reached. I feel that Canadians do not know enough about what is going on here in this line, and I would like to put in a very strong plea as to the excellence of these productions and that the C.B.C. should use them more in their programmes, as Mr. VanValkenburg was just saying, because it would be a saving and economy for all concerned.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne, are you taking this one?

MR. COYNE: I have just one or two questions, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Van Valkenburg, is there any other permanent professional opera company in Toronto?

MR. VanVALKENBURG: Not in Toronto, no.

MR. COYNE: Are there others elsewhere in Canada?

MR. VanVALKENBURG: There is the Montreal Opera Guild. I am not sure I am using the correct term. In Montreal it has been putting on two or three performances a year, but I believe they use the star system and import that. I do not think they could be called a purely Canadian company in the same sense we are.

MR. COYNE: From your knowledge, do they have as extensive a programme of performances in the year as you have?

MR. VanVALKENBURG: No. They give what, two or three performances?

MR. GEIGER-TOREL: Two or three productions. I do not know how many performances. Sometimes two or three performances of each production.

MR. COYNE: Really in a sense your company is unique in Canada?

MR. GEIGER-TOREL: Perhaps the Theatre of Stars in Vancouver, which is a theatre of light opera and music, is somewhat similar, but it is a professional operatic company, not educating people to opera but giving quite a lot of money to Canadian art.

MR. COYNE: Have you ever approached the C.B.C. or had any negotiations with them with a view to presenting broadcasts of your performances?

MR. VanVALKENBURG: Yes, I feel perhaps, Mr. Chairman, our position is quite different from what you may be running into. We come not to bury the C.B.C. but to praise them. I believe we would have a very difficult time operating if it were not for the operation of the C.B.C. C.B.C. has been the "great father" as far as providing a livelihood in Canada for musicians, and we are very grateful too, especially for their initiative and courage in doing that, so we have been from time to time in touch with the C.B.C., and as I say, we are not here to make complaints about the C.B.C., but since your

Commission is formed it seemed this would be a time for us to go on record with some suggestions we have to make.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Coyne's question really was on the specific item of, let us say, televising productions, item 2, when a musical preparation and staging and so on is done following your Festival. And then, consultation for the purposes of inquiring into more economical methods of producing. It is a good thing for us to know about this, but you do not need a Royal Commission to go to the C.B.C.

We just wondered if you had, in fact, examined this matter of telecasting these opera productions with the C.B.C. or not?

MR. VanVALKENBURG: There was some discussion last year with the C.B.C. as to the possibility of televising during a live performance, and that was something we felt could not be satisfactorily done, and we have not gone so far as we would now like to, in proposing live television performances take place on Sunday afternoon or sometime when the theatre is empty. Our reason for coming to this Commission was that it was formed and taking information as to this, and we feel that although our relationships with C.B.C. are very pleasant and friendly there is more that could be done in their interests and in ours.

MR. COYNE: Your position really is that there is room for considerable development?

MR. VanVALKENBURG: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Directed to more broadcasting of opera performances?

MR. GEIGER-TOREL: There has been the so-called C.B.C. Opera Company, and this company uses more than 80% of our soloists, and we cannot see our soloists because our company has only a two-week season and C.B.C. used to produce six operas a year in Toronto. It has been reduced during the last years to a minimum of one production a year, last season. Other productions came from Montreal, and we have the feeling that broadcasting system for live performances would be feasible as it is done in many theatres of the world.

MR. COYNE: That is by radio?

MR. GEIGER-TOREL: Radio. T.V. has been producing many operas. I have practically staged all these operas proceeding from Toronto. Quantity of these operas have been reduced also very drastically, and might be in Toronto because in Montreal they are very strong. An opera almost every week.

MR. COYNE: Just on that point, I notice you say a balance should be reached between Toronto and Montreal. Do you feel that the matter is somewhat out of balance at the moment?

MR. GEIGER-TOREL: It is practically not our business to say so, because it is the business of the C.B.C., but we felt that drastic change was a little bit rough for all musicians and singers here in the city, from one year to the other, practically they all wait, and all dramatic productions

come from Montreal, and Montreal television produced practically every week an operatic programme, and we had the privilege and honour to produce just one opera in one season. That was the Marriage of Figaro. I can say here that the artists and musicians felt sore, they felt very hurt, not only financially, which is understandable.

MR. COYNE: Are the Montreal broadcasts in the French network or English?

MR. GEIGER-TOREL: No. That is "The Concert Hour", or sometimes it went into "Folio" programme.

MR. COYNE: Those are productions by the C.B.C.?

MR. GEIGER-TOREL: Yes. They have nothing to do with our organization. The Association think there might be a system of re-telecasting perhaps one show from the theatre when audiences are not in the theatre, that that would be feasible and cheaper. In other words, on a Sunday when usually Folio is taking place at night, an opera like the "Abduction from the Seraglio" by Mozart, or whatever we have in the repertoire, could be taken into consideration for telecasting purposes.

The whole staff of the C.B.C. could walk into the theatre and use our scenery and use our artists that have been prepared, and adapt their camera work and sound tracks to the stage, and we adapt our acting a little bit to their camera work. This has been done and it is not entirely

unsatisfactory.

Artistically, there are varied problems and varied objections made against this, but it is a way of making wider the approach to opera and making it possible to economize, at least with one or two productions a year.

We have done operas like "The Consul", and "Don Giovanni" in T.V. where the C.B.C. has used lots of the cast who have performed in our Opera Festival. In other words, these singers have known their operas, musical rehearsals have not been that necessary, not that frequent, as it is usually done. But I think it did not contribute too much saving; as soon as you go into the studios for television and produce an opera there you may save a small amount of money in rehearsal time, but it is not essential for the over-all budget. I think unless you deal directly through the theatre you will not be able to save a great deal. In putting a telecast through the studio, it provides the same thing in the studio with other sets and other costumes, etc.

(Page 2710 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: When you were talking about the difficulties of doing it the way you suggest I assume you are thinking in terms of the physical things such making the camera operate properly. But a television show is not just setting a camera down turning it on and leaving it running. There are little techniques, it is not the music of the opera.

MR. GEIGER_TOREL: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: And isn't there also the problem of timing, that you have in some extent to tailor the production to the period of time that you are going to have available.

MR. GEIGER-TOREL: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That might be more difficult on a mere adaptation of your existing production mightn't it?

MR. GEIGER-TOREL: Oh, it would create difficulty, but it could be over come.

THE CHAIRMAN: One other question and that is a fairly general one: Do you feel that radio or television is the more appropriate medium for opera? The reason behind my question, so that you will understand the question, is that you may have seen the American production of "Producer's Showcase" that was on some time ago, and it seemed to me, and I had a little feeling myself that in the opera scenes the television camera was pretty hard put to it to keep itself busy moving through the opera

scenes, whereas the actual music was perfect. Now, is that a thing that should only be on radio or should it be on television as well?

MR. GEIGER-TOREL: You are referring to the variety show of different operatic scenes on "Producer's Showcase" I think it was the ^{thing} most appalling/I have ever seen, and if it is done that way then television should never produce opera at all, and it is only radio who should do it because you can't see it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well I didn't have such words; but let us take the one thing as an illustration. Let us take the telecasting of opera, does the camera work tend to interfere with what is the prime function -music?

MR. VanVALKENBURG: May I answer that question from a personal reaction to them. There are some art forms that suffer from televising so far as my reaction is concerned. Ballet loses a very great deal of the charm that it has in the theatre. The symphony productions are perhaps the best; they lose the least. Opera would come in between, and it would be losing something. But as compared with the symphony programme, for instance - the visual aspect of a symphony programme is a very secondary and unimportant thing, whereas in opera the whole art formed depends on the blend of the visual and the oral.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you are right. My question was more properly with reference to

symphony orchestras.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Then, I take it that you feel that in the matter of reproducing music - here I will forget the operas for the time being - that radio is the best medium?

MR. GEIGER-TOREL: For absolute music, yes.

DR. NEEL: Every time.

MR. GEIGER-TOREL: Infinitely.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then, one other question, on your number two proposal the the CBCB should televise some or all of the productions of the festival, perhaps after you had done the rehearsal and preparatory work immediately after an annual festival have you considered whether that would involve you in problems under your labor agreements with your musicians?

MR. GEIGER-TOREL: Oh, yes.

MR. VanVALKENBURG: Yes; except that there is one word in paragraph two which I think we should change - two words - "immediately following" should be "during or after".

THE CHAIRMAN: The point I am thinking of is that as I understand it if your musicians are appearing for a certain audience that sees the festival their contract calls for one kind of remuneration, if their playing is going to be picked up at the time of one of your performances and it is going to be picked up and telecast or broadcast, then they would expect a very much greater payment?

MR. GEIGER-TOREL: Yes; that would be

part of the cost of the production.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Have you any knowledge as to what the additional payment is for?

MR. GEIGER-TOREL: Not off hand; for whatever it is the musicians would naturally have to be remunerated extra for telecasting, but still it would be a saving for you haven't to rehearse - or to rehearse so much, I mean. You have to rehearse but during the day.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Have you any preference? Would you object to a delayed telecast or would you prefer to have the show go on to the radio as a live production? What I had in mind was that, of course, time is eaten up at various times of the day by a variety of programmes, and there is the question of getting balance into the programmes; so that it might be desirable from the point of view of the CBC to delay a broadcast.

Would that present any problem for you?

MR. VanVALKENBURG: No. We prefer the live broadcast particularly in the case of television where it suffers by tuning, but so far as radio is concerned, I don't think it would make much difference, because a recording loses very little from the original performance.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Now, one last question: Have you any objection to sponsorship of programmes such as you suggest.

MR. VanVALKENBURG: No. Our paragraph 3 is partially the result of being approached by a potential sponsor last year, and the type

of programme that this potential sponsor wanted involved a television on a Trans-Canada network and it, therefore, involved CBC. When this kind of proposal is made we would like to be able to sit down with the CBC and go very carefully into the costs of what might be a schedule of performance.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you anything further you would like to say.

MR. VanVALKENBURG: Our Director of Music is here, if the Commission would like any comments on this question that you have brought up - Mr. Geoffrey Waddington.

THE CHAIRMAN: We would like to hear what comments he would like to make on this.

MR. WADDINGTON: We have been very closely associated with opera activities in this country, Mr. Chairman, I think you will agree, inasmuch as we set two or three years ago an Opera Committee operating within CBC, and on that Committee was a member of the Toronto Conservatory which sponsored the Opera Festival. We have worked very closely with them.

I think the facts are that the employment of artists, generally speaking, across the country makes it possible for such organizations as the Opera Festival to operate. We provide a major part of the employment for these people. I am convinced in my own mind - I can actually prove it if necessary, by facts and figures - that if

we did not do this, these people would not be available to the Opera Association. They just couldn't be, because they couldn't exist.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is generally recognized by all the operatic and orchestral witnesses we have had.

MR. WADDINGTON: I appreciate there has been said by Mr. VanValkenburg and Mr. Torel - and we know this too - good things about these telecasts from the theatre. This we know is not successful, sir. Opera has to be adapted to a new medium, which is television, and it probably would be interesting for one occasion to televize an actual performance from the theatre. NBC have tried this and discarded it as not successful.

THE CHAIRMAN: NBC did you say?

MR. WADDINGTON: Yes. So it is a completely new thing, and what, sir, will eventually evolve is this, that an opera will be written for television, not for the stage, and we are very conscious of that.

THE CHAIRMAN: What about radio, Mr. Waddington? Is the suggestion as to the picking up in the theatre equally applicable to radio recording as it would be to television.

MR. WADDINGTON: No, it isn't; indeed it is not, because I can cite you an example - or examples - that when they record, for instance opera in the United States or in Canada they do not record it from the stage, they set up a special recording session. Those who are appearing get a better pick-up and musical

reproduction than you can possibly get from the stage.

THE CHAIRMAN: But the radio operas that we are getting through from the Metropolitan comes live from the station, doesn't it?

MR. WADDINGTON: It does, indeed, but I would suggest that to compare that with a recorded version of that opera, there is a great difference.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would be quite prepared to admit that, but at the same time you have the cost factor - that must be very different.

MR. WADDINGTON: The cost factor will differ; but if we, for example, went into the Royal Alexander Theatre during a production of the Festival - we have labor problems there, too.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I know.

MR. WADDINGTON: And if you add things up - and artistic values have to come into effect there - you can't divide them - as I say we found that taking all these costs into consideration we would rather do it from a studio.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wonder, Mr. Waddington, if it would be an imposition to ask if someone in your department could give us - it could be sent to us - the comparative cost, let us say, for radio recording an opera which this Opera Festival might be putting on from the stage of the Royal Alexander Theatre, as compared with doing the same opera with the somewhat better

reproduction that you would get in a re-run or producing it in the studio or the CBC.

MR. WADDINGTON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would be interested to see what the comparison of costs would be.

MR. WADDINGTON: That could be done, definitely.

THE CHAIRMAN: While you are here - we will probably want to talk to you again - but have you any comments to put it in a flippant way, as to how much opera the Canadian public will stand?

MR. WADDINGTON: It is a difficult question to answer, sir. Before answering that I should say that I am an enthusiast for music---

THE CHAIRMAN: You are what?

MR. WADDINGTON: I am an enthusiast for music, generally speaking, and I would like to see more of it done, but whether it is within our province --- opera comes into this yes.

I noticed this morning, it was mentioned about how many opera productions came from Toronto. I think it should be pointed out that we in the CBC are a national organization and while, from year to year, it might be that we do four from Toronto and we might do six from Montreal, or we might do one from Toronto and eight from Montreal, this is our function, that we are not concerned with where they are done. What we are concerned with is how they are done. If a certain opera can be done best from Montreal, that in my opinion as a producer is where the thing must be done.

This may result in Toronto probably not having as many opera productions as they would in any given year.

The same thing applies that if Winnipeg comes up with something, and they have developed for this reason or that reason, taking into consideration artistic factors - you may have a certain person in Winnipeg who sings a certain thing particularly well, better than they might do it in Montreal, these things all come into consideration. I say we wouldn't do that thing and that will probably block out something in Toronto.

(Page 2719 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: But you say the balance of this sort of thing shifts from year to year?

MR. WADDINGTON: It has to if we are to operate on a national basis.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, as I said before, we appreciate your being here and we will probably want to have longer talks with you before we are through our work. Have you anything to add, Mr. VanValkenburg? I think we are through with our questions.

MR. VanVALKENBURG: I would just to again review the points, the main points we are trying to make here. Dr. Neel has given testimony as an authority on an international level as to the type of artists and type of production we have in this country. In Toronto we would hope that the CBC would help both themselves and us since we are struggling, like any cultural organization is against considerable odds. We would hope that we could during or after our festival put it on radio or on television and that this suggestion of ours of televising from the stage not during the public performance but at a time when no audience is present, that that be investigated and it might lead to something. We have made our point about our appreciation of what the CBC has done in supporting artists and we would hope that if more economical methods are found that more operas could be produced and a fair share of this could come to Toronto in terms of talent in both cities. There is one

thing we were concerned with, one of our objects is to develop and satisfy an opera audience in Canada, that is one thing we have been working on for many years and we do feel that whereas there is a minority of people in the field of symphonic music who should be served, contemporary music and would not be satisfied with anything else, that as far as the audience for opera is concerned that there are some performances given which are inclined we think, to antagonize a prospective opera lover, some of the more modern ones. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for the brief we will give it consideration and we appreciate your coming.

NATIONAL RELIGIOUS ADVISORY
COUNCIL of CBC

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a number of members of this organization with us today. Mr. Borneman would you introduce the group with you.

MR. BORNEMAN: Mr. Chairman on the last page of the brief are a list of the complete committee and the representatives of the council with us this morning are Father Lanphier of the Roman Catholic Church; Reverend Farmer of the Baptist Church and Reverend Mutchmor of the United Church.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will mark the brief as exhibit 116.

EXHIBIT NO. 116: Brief submitted by the National Religious Advisory Council of CBC.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you proceed to read it or outline it as you feel best. It is not very long and perhaps you would care to read it.

MR. BORNEMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we might just summarize it. The Council is composed of two members of each of the six major faiths in Canada and as such represents 90% of the religious persuasions in this country. It handles all the religious broadcasts and problems of the corporation and in presenting this brief we put forward to the Commission three matters; first, that it maintain publicly owned stations and networks in Canada, both radio and T.V. secondly, that it guard the determining factors of broadcasting that the monetary factor be not primary and thirdly, that it finds ways and means of enlarging the religious staff of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. That is a summary of the brief, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: I know it is a summary and we have read the brief, but for the purpose of getting it back into our minds would you like to say anything about these three headings that you have.

MR. BORNEMAN: Under publicly owned stations, we believe it has worked out best as far as religious broadcasting is concerned in Canada that we have public and private broadcasting. In Britian they have by and large mostly public broadcasting and there it is controlled. In the

States it was private and, for instance, the CBC would give free time but now the CBC has changed its policy and is now selling time to religious broadcasts, so here you have Canada in between this public and private and we feel it has worked out best for individual denominations that want to use the media of television that they can buy time. Those denominations that are unable to buy time because of their size of facilities are given free time on the public stations, that is why we feel public and private are advisable. On the second point that the monetary factor be not primary, we feel that religious broadcasting should not be huckstered, it should not be auctioned off to the highest bidder.

On the matter of enlarging the staff, at the present time there are three full time people who in the corporation work in religious broadcasting; at the ten production points across the country there are those who assist in a pool in putting on religious T.V. and radio programmes. However, we feel that a larger staff could assist the churches in putting on better programmes and more efficient and effective programmes for the welfare of our country.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do any of your associates at this time wish to add to this summary of the brief or shall we go on to the questions directly, Mr. de Grandpre?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Could you tell us when this council was formed. Is it of recent date or has it been operating within the CBC for a number of years?

MR. BORNEMAN: I think Dr. Mutchmore can tell you that.

MR. MUTCHMOR: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, the Council was established about eighteen years ago at the suggestion of Mr. Gladstone Murray and from that time the representatives of the six major denominations that are listed here have worked together in a very harmonious and we think a very effective way. I think three of us who are here today were on the original Council. We have tried and I think successfully to provide time for all the religious groups in Canada. I was looking at the schedule for this month and in the schedule there are representatives of the Jewish Faith, the Salvation Army, the Greek Orthodox Church, the Mennonites and so on. Now we have I think been quite fair in the dividing of the time. The Roman Catholic Church has ten half hour programmes one ending at Christmas and the other at Easter across the whole network. Then the main programme for the other denominations is the Church of the Air which is the afternoon programme on Sunday at 4.30 eastern standard time, and it is divided, the first Sunday to the Baptist, the second to the Church of England, third to Presbyterian, the fourth United Church and when there is a fifth Sunday in the month the Lutheran Church and the Lutheran is built up to the proportion of air time at appropriate times.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is interesting to have that.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And what is the exact role of the council, does it simply allot the time, the periods to the various denominations or does it do something else? Does it prepare programmes and make sure the programmes will not offend in any way, or what is the exact role played by the council?

MR. BORNEMAN: It controls all the programmes, all the religious programmes that are on the air in this way that if there is anything offensive then it is brought to the attention of the corporation and the attention of the denomination which presented it. It has neither the ability or the time, we are very sorry about that to prepare scripts and programmes. The members of the council are full time priests and ministers, meaning that they are spending all their time in their work. The Council feels that it is advantageous to have full time parish priests and ministers on the Council so as to have a variety of religions on the council. Not only does it control the broadcasting but it sees to it that every denomination is properly presented on the air and on T.V. to the public.

MR. de GRANDPRE: What do you mean by controlling the broadcasting?

MR. BORNEMAN: Not censoring the groups in any way but trying to keep the broadcasts in keeping with the Commissions rules and regulations.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And how often do you meet?

MR. BORNEMAN: Monthly.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Only on request.

MR. BORNEMAN: Monthly.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Every Monday.

MR. BORNEMAN: Monthly.

MR. FARMER: May I add a word on that? Actually this Council I suppose technically is in the nature of a committee of CBC.

THE CHAIRMAN: An advisory committee?

MR. FARMER: An advisory committee of the CBC. It is made up of persons who have been nominated by these organizations and subsequently appointed, their names are approved by the Board of Governors and we are technically a committee of the CBC itself.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you say you were appointed by the Board of Governors out of a list submitted by the various denominations---

MR. FARMER: What happens is, the names are put in and passed through the council and forwarded to the Board of Governors and they actually make the appointment and any name that has been presented has been appointed, we have never had a name refused.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just one point I am not clear on, your brief starts out by saying the National Religious Advisory Council is a council of the CBC?

MR. BORNEMAN: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you say that there are two representatives from each of the six major faiths and the corporation appoints these men to the council upon the recommendation of the various denominations and the council, now is there a religious advisory council apart altogether from the CBC?

MR. BORNEMAN: No, there is not, sir. May I mention the procedure?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, please do.

MR. BORNEMAN: For instance, the Lutheran Church would nominate a man for representation on the Council and the name would be submitted to the National Religious Advisory Council, that is this council. Then this council would accept this and recommend to the Board of Governors that this be the Lutheran representative on corporations council.

THE CHAIRMAN: And then the Board of Governors accepts in most cases the recommendation so made.

MR. BORNEMAN: I have known of one being rejected.

MR. FARMER: And at the meetings these members of the staff, the producer of religious programmes sit in with us, that is a very close relationship at the meetings because there are usually two or three of them sit in.

MR. de GRANDPRE: May I ask if these representatives are all from the Toronto area or are some members of the Council from Vancouver

or Winnipeg or the Maritimes.

MR. BORNEMAN: At the present time they are all from the Toronto area. There was a time when we had a man from Ottawa.

MR. MUTCHMOR: Yes, we had a representative in Ottawa and now we have one from Kitchener and we have had one coming in from Hamilton. As the changes are made it depends on the location of the men who are recommended, I do not think geography has had anything to do with the recommendation as to the name, but I assume they do select men who are in or near Toronto. On the other hand we have also regional committees and we communicate with these regional committees from time to time regarding the development of radio and T.V. and in that way we get a wider representation.

THE CHAIRMAN: And this is done by the group?

MR. BORNEMAN: Yes, by the National Religious Advisory Council and it is also done within the commands themselves, they have radio committees.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But these committees are independent of the CBC, they are committees of various denominations.

MR. BORNEMAN: Well strictly speaking the committee in Toronto and Winnipeg and so on are set up with the knowledge of the National Religious Advisory Council.

THE CHAIRMAN: And the CBC.

MR. MUTCHMOR: And the CBC, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we had it out west it was suggested there was in effect a religious advisory council of the CBC in Winnipeg.

MR. MUTCHMOR: Yes, in Winnipeg, where they put on at the Easter season the first T.V. religious telecast, that was done under the direction of the regional committee and with our knowledge.

(Page 2729 follows)

MR. LANPHIER: Mr. Chairman, in order to avoid a misconception, this is the English speaking National Religious Advisory Council. There may be the same thing in Quebec and dealing with the Maritime provinces, and I expect it is under the aegis of the CBC.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you are talking about the French programme?

MR. LANPHIER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I assume there is a CBC French Advisory Council?

MR. LANPHIER: That I don't know.

MR. BORNEMAN : I don't know if there is an official advisory council controlling the French network, but this is the English. No, I don't even think that: we have not been limited, I don't think by the corporation to the English or French.

MR. LANPHIER: I thought it was understood we never dealt with any of the French problems whatever on this Council.

MR. de GRANDPRE: A little reading of your first recommendation, "to maintain in publicly owned stations and network (radio and T.V. in Canada)"; I would not like to say it has misled me, but it did slightly when you mentioned that you wished to continue the public system working in co-operation with the privately owned stations: that is what you have in mind.

MR. BORNEMAN : Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You do not recommend going one step further and making the whole system a publicly owned system?

MR. BORNEMAN : No, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You want to remain in status quo?

MR. BORNEMAN : Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you leave that does your committee have anything to do with the religious broadcasts on private stations?

MR. MUTCHMOR: I think, Mr. Chairman, we are in a dual capacity; those of us who are on the National Advisory Council are also on the Religious radio and T.V. committees of our community. Father Lanphier has been in his field for a long time with the Roman Catholic Church and the League of St. Michaels. As we think and act we do so both as church men and as members of this National Religious Advisory Committee and we are well aware that throughout Canada the churches are helped greatly by private stations providing time either on a payment basis, or in some instances, without payment. We know that quite well. For example, in London, there is no charge made for religious broadcasting or religious T.V. by a private station, and so we appreciate the value that is derived from this system partly private and partly public. As our chairman has said, we think that is a good arrangement.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am glad to have those comments but my question simply was, does the function of your Council extend to the programming in any respect of the private stations in the religious field?

MR. BORNEMAN : We have not exercised any power in that respect. If there is a complaint to the corporation by any individual in Canada, any station on religious broadcasting, often the station will turn its problem over to us, but generally speaking, there is no control of private broadcasts. We in no way interfere.

THE CHAIRMAN: One of the things we are continually hearing is that the CBC has a dual role of being competitor and regulator, I want to know whether in this one field of religious broadcasting the committee of the CBC was doing any controlling.

MR. BORNEMAN : No, sir.

MR. MUTCHMOR: And Mr. Chairman, through the years, there have been occasions when, certainly matters have been reviewed. There have been some disc programmes that have come in from the United States and been put on private stations of which there has been criticism, and that criticism has come to the Council and it has been dealt with.

THE CHAIRMAN: So you are used really to advise on complaints?

MR. MUTCHMOR: There have been such cases. In T.V. from a private station not

very far from this city, there is a programme on healing, so-called, that at least has come to our attention in informal comment, and the members will bear me out that if it should come we would consider it.

THE CHAIRMAN: But it is a fact that you do not do for the private stations -- let us take this business of trying to achieve a balance in broadcasting; you do that for the CBC stations and programmes, but you don't do it for the private stations? None of you happen to serve on a Religious Advisory Council of the CARTB, do you, is there such a thing?

MR. BORNEMAN : No, there is not.

MR. FARMER: I think this may be added, that one programme that is a very popular programme across the country is the programme on many stations, both private and CBC, of Morning Devotions. In each centre there are local committees set up, and most of them have not been set up at our instance at all, but by the local churches, and for the most part, while we have a general responsibility to advise the CBC in all such matters, in most of these cases there has been nothing for us really to do. Occasionally there have been cases where we find one denomination has been doing all the morning devotions on a certain station, sometimes a private station, and sometimes this matter has been referred to us and we have had something to say about it, not by going to the CBC and

asking directions, but rather going back to the denomination and saying, "listen; Mr. So and so ought to contact some of his fellow ministers and see if it cannot be worked out", and that has been done. So our touch on these local committees has been very light. We stay away from any attempt for the most part to say to the CBC, "we think you ought to try to regulate this thing". Those things have been ironed out in that way.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would it be fair to summarize this part in this way; that whatever contact there has been with religious broadcasts on private stations it has been of a very casual, intermittent nature, and really not very much in the way of regulation?

MR. BORNEMAN : That is right.

MR. de GRANDPRE: There are two sentences which I will read together on page 2 of your brief, they actually do not follow, but I think it will help for the understanding of the second sentence. In the middle of the paragraph numbered 1: "to maintain publicly owned stations", and you say, "the voice of religion is prophetic, that is, it is from God, and not from man.", and then the first sentence of the next paragraph starts, "the Government has the responsibility of assuring that voice to be spoken." Having stated this you conclude by making a third recommendation to find ways and means of enlarging the

religious staff of the CBC. I am putting this question to you: is it in fact the responsibility of the CBC to enlarge its staff to produce these programmes, or isn't it the responsibility of various denominations to produce attractive programmes and to obtain time from the CBC?

MR. BORNEMAN : Many of the denominations are spending time and money and effort in producing programmes and then offering them to CBC and asking for time, such as you have the Roman Catholic programme of Bishop Sheen on television and the Lutheran series This is the Life on television. So it should be the responsibility of the denominations to do that, and many denominations are doing it, however, with technical assistance the denominations need help and they need a great deal of help to put on a programme that is satisfactory to radio and T.V.

MR. de GRANDPRE: The point I am making is that wouldn't it be the responsibility of the religious denominations to obtain this technical help so that the programme would be produced in such a manner and in such a form that it would be a good broadcast, because you are not the only organization that has come before us, and they are all asking for the CBC to do this and that and of course, it is a question of finance all the time. It is true that CBC has a wide and large responsibility to the Canadian public, but

it can only carry a certain amount of responsibility otherwise it would not be able to stand up. Is it not a fact the responsibility of the CBC ---- the way you put it, "the Government has the responsibility of assuring that voice to be spoken"; is it too wide a statement or too sweeping a statement?

MR. BORNEMAN : The intention of it, sir, is for the welfare of the nation that religion be heard and used - for the welfare of the nation.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I agree; that is giving you the proper time to do it. But is it the role of the CBC or Government to produce these programmes and to have a larger staff on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation?

MR. LANPHIER: They produce a number of religious programmes themselves outside of our coverage, but I think basically your assumption is correct: it is our responsibility to produce our own shows and then claim the time from the CBC on television or radio. Actually the CBC, I believe are producing a number of programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. de Grandpre is really suggesting that religion has to raise its own voice.

MR. LANPHIER: That is correct.

MR. MITCHMOR: This takes us right into the whole area of the relation of Church and State.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I know.

MR. MUTCHMOR: In this new complex society into which we have come, and particularly in the field of television where the cost of production is so high, the religious denominations are faced with a task which is not impossible, as has been shown by the Bishop Sheen programme and the Lutheran Hour; it is not impossible to undertake; on the other hand, there is some doubt as to whether the churches can measure up to the full responsibility that they have in this total field, and I think personally at least, that just as the Massey Commission report and the recommendation that the State do something about this Canada Council which we hope will be established someday to support culture, so the state may very well have in mind doing something more in the field of reporting the cost of religion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but you are really thinking in terms of technical assistance, knowledge of the new medium and these problems of air time and television time being granted on its own facilities; because otherwise don't you think that you, just as you said, get into some very difficult problems of Church and State?

MR. MUTCHMOR: Reference has been made to the BBC, and of course, in England there is the established Church and they have a large staff for religious work, and the question does not arise because of

that relationship. On the other hand in Canada are the churches to be compelled to go to private groups, large corporations, for example, and ask them to sponsor programmes to assist them on the financial part of the work or is some of that at least to be made available by the State? Were it not for the fact the T.V. is so costly I don't think this question would arise.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Is it necessary to have religious broadcasts on T.V., or could you not have the same results by going on radio alone?

MR. MITCHEMOR: Oh my goodness, no.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You think T.V. lends itself to religious broadcasts?

MR. BORNEMAN : I don't think it is a question of which lends itself better, as it is the wish of the people using the media they are using today. We feel they are using T.V. far more in larger metropolitan areas than they are using radio, and in order to get to the people you must come to the medium they are using.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Is it not a temporary impact of T.V. on radio and that radio will again take its place as a medium?

MR. BORNEMAN : Only time will tell that, but it seems there are certain hours more advantageous to radio and certain hours more advantageous to T.V. The morning religious shows on radio have gone over very well but we wonder whether a programme at 8 o'clock

could compete with T.V.

FR. LANPHIER: Religion is competing with the best programmes on T.V. at the present time, and it is a medium that we believe should be used more extensively. I don't think radio is slipping as far as the listening audience on religion is concerned. I think we are retaining the same portion as we did prior to the coming of T.V.

THE CHAIRMAN: The argument has been put to us that there has been a novelty impact of T.V. which may at some stage tend to decline and settle down into a new relationship between radio and television with the probability that radio will have to adapt itself and its techniques to the existence of T.V. and adopt special techniques of this sort which may still have not been developed. With regard to the future of radio there is still a lot for it to do, and I assume you would say there is a lot to do in the religious field.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You have had a very considerable experience Father Lanphier on St. Michaels hour on Sunday afternoons?

FR. LANPHIER: Oh, yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Has the television reduced your listening audience by any chance?

FR. LANPHIER: I personally don't think so. We are not on a competitive hour, for one thing and we also have a long

established tradition; it is still there, and we have got a built-up radio audience over the years.

MR. FARMER: Mr. Chairman, so far in the matter of religious broadcasting or religious telecasting we have been able to hear and, of course, to telecast religious services and that has been a matter of very great interest to many people. As long as it is a matter of the Churches putting on service and the CBC coming in and telecasting it, that is very simple for the churches, but when it comes to other types of programmes, the same situation arises, as would arise in opera, that that may not be the most satisfactory way of transmitting the religious message, and when it comes to the whole question of drama and special types of broadcasting that could carry religious messages that is where you get into all the technical difficulties. I had the privilege last summer of spending a few days at the BBC in London and attending one of the meetings of the staff of the Religious Department.

(Page 2740 follows)

MR. BORNEMAN: I understand at that time that there were 22 men on the staff where we have just two or three doing the type of work that these 22 men were doing. Now the situation of course is different the setting is different. And these figures, that is not altogether a comparable figure, but I am suggesting that there is -- they are able to do things we cannot undertake at all. Just by way of illustration, there was a case of a west end mission doing a very special type of work in the east end of London, and they have services, a very large manner of special types and qualities of services, Young Peoples and Boys Groups, and all that sort of thing. Now the BBC, can pick up the atmosphere and message and so on of that mission, it was arranged that a man went down a whole year ahead and made a preliminary investigation. There was co-operation with the local authorities and co-operation with the appropriate men in the religious department of the BBC, and from time to time the matter was set up so that eventually there was a telecast of the work and the message of that particular thing. It was a representative type of mission. But it involved a great deal of technical adaptation and showed the work of the week, the sort of thing that might be done here with regard to a place like Greenwood, show the work of the week, the activities, service, all compacted

into a short telecast. That could be done there. It would be an extraordinarily difficult thing to do with the type of set-up that we have here, and I think that something of that kind -- using that just by way of illustration -- certain types of special programmes require more of the work of people interested in technical work, and yet there is a need. There is the need if that type of thing is to be done in the religious field that it be supervised by men who have a religious background and training to handle it. I do not think it would be satisfactory for people working entirely outside of that field. That is the one point on the question of staff.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Coming back to your role within the CBC, do you have anything to do with the regulations concerning religious broadcasting? Do you set up, or are the rules discussed within the Council before being adapted by the Board of Governors?

MR. BORNEMAN: I believe the rules were set up, sir, before the Council came into existence. The rules were set up by the Board of Governors as I understand it.

FR. LANPHIER: I think the rules and regulations governing broadcasting arose after the formation by Gladstone Murray. We had gone through a period of gestation and trial and after four or five years they laid down the rules to which all denominations are supposed to adhere.

MR. de GRANDPRE: The reason of my question is this: regulation 501 of the CBC reads as follows: "no station shall broadcast except with the consent in writing of a representative of the corporation any appeal for donations or subscriptions in money or time on behalf of any person or organization other than churches or religious bodies permanently established in Canada and serving the area covered by the station".

This is a regulation which is akin to religious broadcasts. We had some representations made while we were in Edmonton that there was no reason for this last part of the regulation which says, "and serving the area covered by the station". Is the argument being made if it is a valid appeal within the area, why should it not be a valid appeal throughout the country and was any such aspect of this regulation ever discussed within the council?

MR. BORNEMAN: No, sir, not to my knowledge.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Would you like to comment on it?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I think we can get at it another way. If it is in the area of the station it means they cannot appeal over the network. Do any of the religious broadcasts go over a network.

MR. BORNEMAN: You mean - there are private networks.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Are they single station broadcasts?

MR. BORNEMAN: Single station broadcasts.

MR. FARMER: Church services go over the network. That is a special half hour network.

MR. BORNEMAN: No appeal goes over the public network for funds. I believe you have several briefs to that effect, complaining about regulation 591. It would not be fair for me to speak on it because one of the briefs came from my group and I believe they are presenting that next Tuesday.

MR. FARMER: It seems to me possibly one of the reasons for this exception with regard to the Churches is that there have been on local stations regularly both CBC stations where it is not - the CJBC is not on the network but it broadcasts a local service. It broadcasts a whole service and perhaps in the middle of it the minister may give an announcement and he may say at that moment "the offering will now be received". He may make some reference to it, but in many cases that has been put over until after the broadcast is over. It allows a case of an ordinary announcement of the offering being made with infringing on the regulations.

MR. BORNEMAN: You have a subsidized programme that is brought into Canada. It is processed in the United States, and broadcast over private stations in Canada and in this processed programme they ask for funds. It

is a subsidized programme, and this particular programme contributes one third of the station time, one third of the cost of the stations time comes from the States and two thirds is collected by the listening audience by public appeal so that when this regulation was made, "no appeal", then it cut off all the Canadian contributions meaning that the entire programme which goes over about 32 stations had to be subsidized completely from the States.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is this an actual case that existed before this regulation came in? I may have missed the start.

MR. BORNEMAN: Yes, this is an actual case.

THE CHAIRMAN: And this was --

MR. BORNEMAN: This was not discussed with the National Religious Advisory Council.

THE CHAIRMAN: You must have been exposed to it and maybe you can give us some facts. If you do not mind, Mr. de Grandpre.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you used the phrase "huckstering" in religion, when you were presenting your brief, and maybe it is my phrase written down here, but in any case isn't there this problem in connection with religious broadcasts?

MR. LANPHIER: Mr. Chairman, perhaps that comes under the question of the monarchy part of writing. The CBC is trying to adhere to

a rule that all religious programmes on radio and television are to be presented without commercial backing. The principle - I think our council is fairly well agreed, perhaps not unanimously - but the principle is more idealistic than the fact of having to be commercially sponsored, although there are plenty of exceptions to the rule. For instance, Good Year Tire sponsor - what is the name of that programme? - "Greatest Story Ever Told", and I believe the Trull Funeral Home sponsors a Hymnal programme, and the Admiral Corporation also sponsor Bishop Sheen. We did have quite a little controversy in the question of Bishop Sheen's programme, to have it put on our station here, because of the fact it was sponsored by a commercial organization, and fortunately through the good efforts of the CBC a compromise solution was arrived at. Not so much with the Admiral people, I do not think, as with the organization, the Dumont Organization in the States, whereby the programme was carried here on our local CBC station without any tribute at all to the Admiral people, with the by-line to the Dumont people.

I believe there is a field in the sphere for the commercially sponsored religious programmes, too. That is where they are sponsored by a commercial concern directly like the Admiral people or Good Year People or a

religious group such as Holy Name Society of the Catholic Church or Knights of Columbus or any other group in the various denominations.

What I would like to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, is that at the present time I believe they are serving a good purpose outside of these hot rod evangelists that perhaps do more harm than good on the air, but are primarily perhaps on the air to make money.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was really that, that my question was directed to, whether or not and the extent to which there were any which were basically money making and which might masquerade under the name of religion. Does your committee deal with that kind of thing. Is this one thing that regulations need to deal with.

MR. BORNEMAN: I do not think we have dealt with that particular thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am interested in your views.

FR. LANPHIER: The point is in radio fortunately through independent stations programmes of religion sponsored by commercial organizations can be put on and cover an area in most instances that are not covered - in most instances covered by the CBC - but unfortunately in the television sphere which is somewhat later come day affair in Canada we would have been deprived of Bishop Sheen television programme by the very principles the

C.B.C. are attempting to adhere to, unless there are going to be private stations in Montreal, Toronto and other places.

MR. MUTCHMOR: Mr. Chairman, this subject, as you know, is a very difficult kind of subject, and in the Council when the Bishop Fulton Sheen was presented, the compromise we arrived at, as Father Lanphier said, was the credit line, but nothing more than the credit line.

I do not know on what basis either a public or grouping of private stations could classify a programme that is the religious sponsored type of programme, whether to receive them or to reject them. For example, millionaires in Texas who have made a lot of money out of oil, not to mention gas, and they wish to set up a foundation, and some of them have done that, and these foundations must have a purpose. One of the most readily accepted kind of purpose is the religious purpose, and so the foundation has a religious purpose for keeping clear of taxes and a few other things.

Now then, some of the "hot rod" type, to use Father Lanphier's words, knowing of this, manage to find their way into the good graces of this kind of organization, and they get time on private stations in the United States, and that kind of so-called religious telecast is presented over a network.

Now, this is not at all like a large, bona fide corporation, take Goodyear Tire and "Greatest Story Ever Told". It is quite a different kind of

thing. So, if there is to be commercially-sponsored religious programmes, that kind of question among others will have to be posed and it is not a very easy question to answer. Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. have had considerable experience in this field, and have recently gone on record in opposition to commercially-sponsored T.V. and radio programmes. That, I think, is of worthy note.

MR. de GRANDPRE: When you use the expression "commercial-sponsored programmes", do you make a distinction between a programme for the time of which the denomination has paid money or -- I mean, as a denomination -- or the time of which has been paid by a commercial organization?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the latter.

MR. MUTCHMOR: The latter.

MR. BORNEMAN: That is not the unanimous opinion of Council.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a point here. I thought it was clear ---

MR. BORNEMAN: That is not the unanimous opinion of Council that commercially-presented programmes should not be presented. We are not unanimous on that., I can assure you of that.

FR. LANPHIER: A commercially-sponsored programme is not a necessary evil, and many a fine elevating programme has been put on by commercial houses and organizations, and we would be deprived of that.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Would you, as an

Advisory Council, rather have a permissive clause in there in which you ultimately would advise the C.B.C., or do you prefer the outright prohibition?

FR. LANPHIER: I think a permissive clause would be far more acceptable for we certainly are not going to reach any unanimity on this, for I don't agree with Dr. Mutchmor on many things, but we get along exceptionally well on many problems of the C.B.C.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: As a Council you would feel a permissive clause would be desirable rather than outright prohibition?

MR. BORNEMAN: That question came up, sir, and it was a divided house on that.

MR. MUTCHMOR: And recently this commercial support of a cultural programme has been quite prominent in the Press. We are a little afraid of that kind of thing.

MR. BORNEMAN: The solution might be to have a private T.V. station in these larger areas.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a suggestion coming from a new source now.

FR. LANPHIER: That has been a basic argument all along, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FARMER: That has never been before the Council as such. The policy has been, of course, as far as the C.B.C. is concerned that time for religious broadcasting is not solely -- there has been an exception, as I understand it, with regard to that Goodyear programme, in which case there is no

advertising material except just a statement "This is presented by". There is no so-called commercial. While it is an exception to the general rule, and the Council has considered it, the thing itself seems to be so fine and so generally acceptable, that neither the churches nor anybody else has come along and said on account of that point it ought to come off. It is an exception.

Generally speaking, the C.B.C. does not sell time for religious purposes, and the Council feels, generally speaking, we should leave well enough alone.

THE CHAIRMAN: Except that there seems to be a little disagreement among you?

MR. FARMER: That is right.

FR. LANPHIER: A special function comes along, for example a great anniversary, centenary, or Holy Name demonstration, in which, say, the Holy Name Society approaches that individual station controlled by the C.B.C. and wants to buy an hour or hour and a half to put that programme on the air. There is a commercially-sponsored programme by the Holy Name Society. What is wrong with that?

If we adhere to the principle that all commercially-sponsored religious programmes cannot be bought or accepted by the C.B.C. network, the programme is ruled out, plus many others. But there is a dangerous area.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Has any harm come from the private stations who are permitted, apparently, to carry sponsored religious programmes in

which undesirable content may be included or undesirable sponsors?

MR. MUTCHMOR: I think for us to name names is perhaps not fair, but in Ontario there is a station in a relatively large city that receives programmes from the United States and accepts them and telecasts them

according to the manager of this station with whom I discussed the matter, purely on a commercial basis. The sponsor of this programme pays so much money, good money, and he is glad to get it and takes the programme.

Now, as compared to that attitude of the private station, there is the London Free Press station, and they do not sell time to anybody, but they do provide time for religious radio and religious telecasts, and they are in the private field. You have two kinds of operation.

We are somehow fearful of the commercially-sponsored, which I don't think is the same as the Holy Name Society. I am thinking of an organization that makes a profit in the business world. That kind of organization, out of very good motive, may come into the religious field and do good work, but I think we should mind that kind of organization may come in from a selfish motive and do a very bad work. That is where our views sometimes do not just agree.

(Page 2752 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: Taking your last statement -- I am interested in your last statement -- if the programme itself is acceptable and proper, what is the motive of the sponsor?

MR. MUTCHMOR: If I may speak again, going back to television, and this question that a televised religious service might not be more effective than a radio one, I would like to point out the situation in the United Church about this, that it is our judgment that a televised morning religious service is far more effective than a radio service. I have, with a good conscience, stayed from church to view a number of these services, and I think that when a preacher in the United Church pulpit is preaching the word of God with power and clarity he is doing something on television which cannot be paralleled on the radio.

Now, he is speaking freely as God gives him to speak. If he had a commercial sponsor, there might be some interpretation of a part of the New Testament which he might want to make, but concerning which he might have some doubts, having in mind the sponsor.

I don't think that that kind of situation should arise.

THE CHAIRMAN: But that is a little different to what you said before, because you were talking about the bad motives of the sponsor. That was the way you put it -- that he was doing it for some kind of ulterior motive, which is to sell his

goods, I suppose; but you are now talking about the possible influence on the religious speaker and leader of anything at the back of his mind, that he has got some commercial sponsor. Do you think that would really be likely to be the kind of sponsorship that any denomination would, in fact, accept?

MR. MUTCHMOR: Well, I am just giving you my personal view as to that. I have a fair amount of experience in the Federal Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches, that large corporations in the United States sometimes out of a very good motive on their part may get into a position where they would curb the prophetic word of a religious body. That has happened before in history and it could happen in North America.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are more cynical -- not cynical, but you ^{more} are skeptical about the courage of the religious leaders of Canada than I am. Are they really going to be influenced by the fact that the Goodyear Tire Company people have the "Greatest Story Ever Told" or a similar series of sermons?

FR. LANPHIER: I believe that giving a blanket entitlement to all these programmes -- I don't think it is quite just for the very fact that usually they make money. That is not a bad reason. If a company wants to sell its product, that is perfectly legitimate, just and right. It so happens in the case of Bishop Sheen's programme that he makes somewhere in the vicinity of a million dollars, and the entire million dollars is distributed to

charity -- non-Catholic as well as Catholic. So the company benefits -- they sell their cars -- television benefits, the charities and the people benefit.

MR. BORNEMAN: In the brief there is an interesting sentence, "the Mosaic variety of this Council", and here it is in diversified unanimity?

FR. LANPHIER: You can't expect us all to be in agreement?

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You brought in the sponsoring of "The Greatest Story Ever Told" by Goodyear and also Bishop Sheen, but aren't those dissertations on religious themes by, in all probability, so-called religious persons, as distinct from a religious ceremony, or service being broadcast. Is that where you could draw the line, or is it artistic, or philosophic, or a discussion on a religious theme as distinct from an actual religious ceremony or service? Is that where you could draw the line between sponsorship and not ---

MR. MUTCHMOR: I think there might be a possible drawing of the line there.

In the Council we have dealt with these matters, including the Bishop Fulton Sheen programme, at long discussions, and we have come out with satisfactory answers up to date. We have always made some compromise. But I was speaking of the general principle of commercial sponsorship, and what might be involved in that sponsorship.

I had in mind more particularly the special kind of programme -- not a religious service

from a church, but a series in which a speaker would take a number of subjects and follow them through. Now, then, supposing he is sponsored by a large motor corporation and he is on a series with regard to certain kinds of human relationships, and about the time he is on a particularly interesting subject there is a strike that goes on for four or five months and entirely avoids it because some questions might be asked if he airs his views concerning it and there might be some difficulty -- it is that kind of thing I have in mind.

Don't think I am raising this point out of any lack of confidence in human nature. I think I am just being realistic.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Taking Bishop Sheen's programme, I wouldn't consider it a religious programme, although it is of social and moral implication. That is not actually a religious programme where a ceremony is directly involved, like Mass on television. It is not exactly the same thing. There could be no objection to sponsorship of the Bishop Sheen programme. But, certainly, if it was a High Mass ---

FR. LANPHIER: Bishop Sheen's programme isn't truly a religious programme. It is a philosophical dissertation.

THE CHAIRMAN: But for the purposes of your Committee, or Council, it comes within the group of religious programmes?

FR. LANPHIER: This point was thrashed

out in the United States. It wasn't to be presented truly as a religious programme.

MR. BORNEMAN: One could make quite a few comments about whether it is religious or not?

MR. MUTCHMOR: You are now getting an exhibition, or a sample, of the Advisory Council in session?

MR. FARMER: But this is a very small sample?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: There is one question I would like to ask. We talked about sponsorship and content. Yesterday the Canadian Mental Health Association appeared before us and they said in their brief:

"Some examples of programmes which we
"feel to have had a 'bad' mental health
"effect are as follows:- The Oral Roberts
"Evangelistic Services programme acclaim-
"ing to show spiritual healing..."

I don't want to get into any religious controversy here, but would anybody care to mention the effect -- the bad effect ---

MR. BORNEMAN: The Oral Roberts show is one that should have attention, but it has never officially come to the attention of the Council in any way; so the Council has passed it by; it has not paid attention to it. I believe that if it were to come to the Council, the Council, I believe, would seriously recommend that that programme be dropped from television in Canada, because of the bad effect

it has not only religiously, but ---

COMMISSIONER STEWART: They were talking about commercially upset people.

MR. BORNEMAM: Yes; I believe our Council would advise it. But as yet we have received no official request.

MR. FARMER: That programme is not on a C.B.C. station?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: No, that is a private station.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you all very much for coming and having this discussion.

---A short recess.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would the representatives of the National Religious Advisory Council please come forward again?

I am sorry to bring you back, but there is one point we would like to comment on.

I am sorry that Dr. Mutchmore has gone.

It is a question that Mr. Coyne suggested to me in the interval.

I think you might phrase it, Mr. Coyne.

MR. COYNE: Well, the point was this; isn't the principal function which the National Religious Advisory Council performs allocating and dividing up the time between the different religious bodies in this country; is that so?

MR. BORNEMAN: Yes.

MR. COYNE: We agree that that is the

primary function of your Council?

MR. BORNEMAN: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Then, in relation to the question of sponsorship would it be true to say that if you permit sponsored religious programmes the danger is that you upset that balance by virtue of the fact that the group which has the most funds available for the purchase of time, or the sponsoring of programmes, would be able to enlarge the amount of time available to that particular group than the allocation to the group which, perhaps, would not have sufficient funds to buy an equivalent proportion of the time?

THE CHAIRMAN: Or, putting it even broader than that, Mr. Coyne, not only because they have the money themselves but because, for one reason or another, they are able to command outside sponsorship whereas others may not.

MR. BORNEMAN: Well, Mr. Coyne, that wouldn't be true, that a group could control if you were to eliminate all free time; so the Council in its recommendations and in its discussion on this Bishop Sheen programme came to a compromise that we would have two periods of time. The first would be as it is now, where it is shared proportionately by all denominations so that every denomination has its opportunity, as now. Secondly, we felt that another period of time should be set aside in addition to their paid time, which could be sold for commercially-sponsored programmes, for we recognize that in areas where there are no private T.V. stations, say, a

programme like Bishop Sheen's could not go on T.V.; so we feel that a second period of time should be made available.

That was discussed in Council.

MR. COYNE: Would you agree, though, that with regard to sponsorship, the factor which I have suggested is a factor which would be considered?

MR. FARMER: That is very true.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you like to enlarge on that?

MR. FARMER: I think that is a very important point. If you have so much time that is set aside by the C.B.C. for religious purposes and then you have certain organizations -- they might be very large organizations, sponsors with large sums of money -- it would come almost to the point of selling that time to the highest bidder. In other words, that the person who had the control of the largest amount of funds would be the person, or organization, who would have the right to get the benefit, and we feel that that is a very dangerous situation.

MR. LANPHIER: Theoretically, that is correct. Actually it doesn't work out that way. It hasn't worked out that way either in the United States or Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is that?

MR. LANPHIER: On the independent stations, where they can purchase time, the more influential or more financially-important groups have not bought excessive time in relation to the others; and in

the United States, where they have commercial religious television programmes and broadcasting, I have never heard that they have. Although theoretically correct it has never actually happened.

THE CHAIRMAN: But where you have a publicly-owned corporation such as the C.B.C., and where, presumably, you have to have some rules, at least for that corporation -- that is, for religious broadcasting, administered in this case by your Council, or advised by your Council -- the introduction into that system of sponsorship would certainly create more problems for you in the allocation of time, wouldn't it?

MR. LANPHIER: I think we would do it, or attempt to, on the same proportion as we have already done on radio.

THE CHAIRMAN: We wanted to ask you for your views on that point.

Thank you very much.

SUBMISSION OF UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA

APPEARANCES:

Rev. E.E. Long.

Rev. Dr. Kenneth J. Beaton.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is from the United Church of Canada -- Dr. Beaton and Dr. Long. They are here, I believe.

We will begin by marking your brief as Exhibit 117.

EXHIBIT NO. 117: Brief of the United Church of Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it to be presented by Dr. Beaton or by Dr. Long?

DR. BEATON: By Dr. Long.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Dr. Long, will you proceed to present the brief, either by summarizing it or by reading it, as you see fit?

DR. LONG: I think, Mr. Chairman, as it is fairly long I should like to read parts of it at least and paraphrase little bits.

Dr. Beaton, who has a great deal of experience in this field, will answer any questions you wish to ask.

The brief opens with a quotation from the terms of reference of your own Commission, and we state that we are in substantial agreement with the principles which were set forth by the Prime Minister in setting up this Royal Commission -- that is to say, we believe that the control of radio

and television broadcasting in this country by an independent corporation appointed by the Government of Canada and responsible to Parliament, under which control private stations operate in an effective way, has, in the main, worked out in the best interests of the Canadian public.

The United Church interest is then set forth.

The United Church of Canada represents a large proportion of Canadians and is vitally interested in the use of mass media of communication. There are few people in this country who are not within reach of some one of our 6,212 churches. We have opened an average of one new church every 12 days for the last three years, and yet the census shows that there are still hundreds of thousands who claim allegiance to the United Church -- I think a census would show that there are almost a million -- with whom we have no contact. Because of our desire to reach this untouched constituency, and because we think the use of mass media to be effective in the work of the Church, we have gone into this field, perhaps, far more than other denominations have done in this country. We have our own moving picture department, and have had for ten years; and for the last eight years we have had our own radio studio. Recently we have converted part of a building into a new studio at a cost of \$35,000, and we have about \$80,000 worth of equipment installed to produce radio programmes and to produce films, some of which will be used, we

hope, in T.V. We are carrying our full share of responsibility under the National Religious Advisory Council on the C.B.C. network, and, in addition, we supply private stations with three radio programmes a week. It should be emphasized that only a very few of these programmes carry any credit line for the United Church. We are more interested in helping to raise the standard of religious broadcasting in Canada than we are in securing publicity for ourselves.

There are some things in the present system which do have our commendation and which we should like to mention.

We commend the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for the following achievements:- First, for the development of Canadian talent and general contribution to the cultural life of this country in drama, music, ballet, etcetera.

Notwithstanding the fact that many talented Canadians have gone over from the C.B.C. into the services of the British Broadcasting Corporation and the American networks, nevertheless, in the fields of education, entertainment, and discussion of national and international affairs, the C.B.C. has given to Canada a superior quality of leadership.

We wish especially to commend the system of newscasts without interpretation. We think the people of this country are competent to make their own judgment on news without the help of commentators representing private, party, or other special interests.

We commend the way in which "Weekend Review" is conducted by using various persons from different areas in analyzing the news.

We commend the C.B.C., secondly, for their persistent and successful resistance to pressure to allow liquor advertising on radio and television in those provinces where such advertising is forbidden or only goodwill advertising is allowed. The United Church has very strong convictions on this point and stands unalterably opposed to all forms of advertising of beer, wine and spirituous liquors, but we find the media of mass information, since they come directly into the home and are heard and seen by the whole family, to be particularly insidious. We are concerned especially, as we say here, because of the effect of such advertising on teen-age people. It is our suggestion, in keeping with a resolution of our General Council passed four years ago, that the Dominion Government should begin a campaign of temperance education through radio and television.

We are concerned about the advertising of these products on T.V. stations near the international boundary, which are owned and operated by United States citizens. These programmes, of course, do come into thousands of our homes every day. More dangerous still is the purchase of time on these stations by Canadian breweries and distilleries with the object of reaching Canadians in those provinces where such advertising is forbidden

by law.

In the third place, we commend the C.B.C. for refusing to extend the length of time that may be used for advertising. We think the present time is adequate and there is no public demand for that amount of advertising.

Fourth, programming in Canada, we feel more good Canadian programmes should be exchanged with other countries and systems, and that our Canadian talent is worthy of such exchange.

Finally, we commend them for the time that is provided for religious broadcasting. According to the 1954-5 report of the C.B.C., 669 out of an annual total of 21,905 broadcasting hours were devoted to religion. That seems in comparison quite a small number, but we feel it is a lot better than it could have been and we feel that they try to play fair.

Then, we would like to add three comments and suggestions which are fairly general. The first one is about the National Religious Advisory Council which has been a fairly static body during its many years of history and it has performed a very useful function, but the function of which we think could now be broadened and increased. We believe the time has come when the membership and functions of the N.R.A.C. should be enlarged, the denominations should be asked to co-operate in this by nominating persons to the N.R.A.C., both ministers and lay people who are skilled in the techniques

of broadcasting. It is significant that as religious broadcasting has developed in Canada, the N.R.A.C. is consulted mainly on programmes for the Church of the Air and the religious period. Outside of their purview and, in the main, outside of their advice, the C.B.C. is currently producing the following religious programmes: "Eventide"; "Sunday Corral"; "In His Service"; "World Church News"; "Question Box"; certain plays like the recent production based on the book of Amos. On television the N.R.A.C. has been consulted regarding the local churches which are to have their Sunday morning services broadcast and regarding the Lutheran programme, "This Is The Life", as well as the Roman Catholic programme, "Life Is Worth Living". Such dramas as have been offered on television to date have been entirely C.B.C. productions. We are not unaware of the great contribution that the N.R.A.C. has already made in preserving harmony among the various religious denominations, but we believe the time has come when its influence on the religious broadcasting policy of the whole C.B.C. system should be enlarged and diversified.

Secondly, we have some comments about the religious department of the C.B.C. It is our conviction that the C.B.C. has never really taken religious broadcasting seriously. If the B.B.C. requires nine ordained Protestant clergymen and two Roman Catholic priests to do an adequate job of religious broadcasting, then the staff of the

C.B.C. is by comparison utterly inadequate. The Director is a layman, a very competent and consecrated one, and he has one assistant, an ordained Anglican clergyman. It is significant that when the latter was appointed neither the N.R.A.C. nor the Communions represented knew of it until he was actually at work. This Director has responsibility not only for religious broadcasting, but also for institutional broadcasting and for children's programmes.

If you move from this department to the schools branch you find five men and one woman devoting their time exclusively to school broadcasts, although these can only function about eight months in the year. If the comparison were made with talks or sports or drama, or any other department of the C.B.C., the situation would look still worse.

We think it is relevant to say that the Broadcasting and Film Commission of the National Council of Churches, U.S.A., has a staff of fifty-three, of whom twelve are executives, appointed by the Board of Managers.

The third comment is about the preservation of Canadian cultural heritage and patterns. Because of Canada's peculiar geographic distribution of population, her people being for the most part spread in a narrow band along our southern boundary in close contact with broadcasting centres in the United States, the Canadian radio and television stations have an especial responsibility to preserve and inculcate our Canadian cultural heritage and

patterns. We believe that there is a distinct difference in the outlook of the two peoples on certain basic moral, political and cultural questions, and that there is a great danger that our Canadian viewpoints will be submerged as an increasing number of broadcasts originating in the United States become available to that large portion of the Canadian people who live along the Border. We recognize that there are many fine programmes thus made accessible to Canadians, and that some interchange of cultural achievements is both wise and inevitable. Nevertheless, the Canadian people must be safeguarded from the encroachments of this blatant materialism so evident in many United States programmes, and from the deterioration in family life that is aggravated by the low moral standard characteristic of many such programmes.

Then, finally we have some definite recommendations that we should like to make and they are as follows.

One, we recommend the setting up of a separate religious department in the C.B.C. with an adequate staff to control religious broadcasting. This would provide for the following improvements and expansion:

(a) At staff conferences and programme meetings the Director would represent exclusively this one interest. This should result in the securing of more and better time for religion on the networks, both radio and television. He would have

time to study other programmes on the networks and suggest religious elements that might appropriately be incorporated in them. In some respects this is more important and more effective than special hours set apart for religion. That is so say, the religious content of broadcasting is very often implicit rather than explicit, and that implicit relationship is tremendously important.

(b) The Department of Religious Broadcasting should have more financial support. The 1954-5 report of the C.B.C. says that in that year \$8 million was spent on the development and payment of talent. However, the proportion of it spent on developing and paying script writers, preachers, actors, musicians, and producers in the religious field was infinitesimal. In our opinion this division of funds is entirely unsatisfactory.

(c) One of the major contributions to religious broadcasting which an adequately religious department in the C.B.C. would make would be to supply leadership for radio and T.V. workshops in local areas all across the country. This is related to the fourth improvement to be made: local efforts at religious drama, planned conversations, forums, and other types of programmes would be encouraged. A script library should be maintained and at least one staff member made available to spend time with local groups who are really serious about radio and T.V. production. It seems to us that increasingly the local station holds the key to broadcasting on

both radio and T.V. We know from contacts with local stations, including those in the C.B.C. network, that the managers are very keen on producing more and better programmes of a religious nature and would welcome expert help.

Our second recommendation is this: We recommend more diversified programmes on the network itself. We believe that preaching on radio and T.V. is important and can be effective, but there are other types of programmes which would provide a more inclusive approach, especially to that part of the listening audience which is outside of church membership. We do not think the religious broadcasts should be confined to the presentation of a formal service which, after all, is primarily intended and was developed as a vehicle for leading in worship the congregations which are actually present in the church itself. There are other types of programmes which, through the years, have emerged and which would provide a more inclusive approach, especially to that portion of the listening audience which is entirely outside the church membership.

Third, we recommend that sustaining time for religious programmes should continue to be provided on the C.B.C. networks, and that the C.B.C. regulations should be amended so that it is a condition of securing a license that private stations should extend to local churches the same privilege.

Four, we recommend that while the implementing of the more aggressive and more comprehensive

policy of religious broadcasting which we have indicated in this brief will require considerably increased expenditure, nevertheless, the necessary funds should be provided from the Public Treasury rather than from commercial interests.

Those are the recommendations, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Dr. Long, just looking at the early part of your brief and your general statement, you say:

"We believe that the control of radio
"and television broadcasting in this
"country by an independent corporation
"appointed by the Government of
"Canada and responsible to Parliament,
"under which control private stations
"operate in an effective way, has, in
"the main, worked out in the best
"interests of the Canadian public."

I take it you feel that the present organization or structure of broadcasting, particularly as it has been developed for radio, is the system which we should maintain?

DR. LONG: Yes, we feel that is true.

MR. COYNE: And do you feel that television will, or should, ultimately develop along the same lines? What I mean by the structure is the fact that there is the C.B.C. operating a national service and there are in addition private stations, some of whom are affiliated with the C.B.C. and

some of whom are unaffiliated.

DR. LONG: Yes, we feel that is a good development but that, with this over-all control as has been through the C.B.C. in radio, the whole television, as a medium of mass communication as well, remains a public trust for the benefit of society as a whole.

MR. COYNE: Then you go on to express interest of the United Church in this field and you speak of your own radio programme -- I think you expanded this somewhat in your introductory remarks -- but what sort of work do you do in your radio studio, do you actually produce live programmes that are put on to a station?

DR. LONG: No, Dr. Beaton is the Director of our radio department and I think he could answer that.

DR. BEATON: Everything we have done so far has been on tape. We are currently producing three programmes weekly, one for children, one by men for men, and one a 5-minute morning devotion programme which we asked to have put in the disc jockey period every morning. It is actually only 4½ minutes and we are trying to get an audience that would not normally tune in to morning devotions at 8.15 or 8.45 as they are ordinarily conducted.

THE CHAIRMAN: You will be accused of false pretences if you are not careful.

MR. COYNE: How do you arrange for the distribution of these programmes?

DR. LONG: None of these programmes so far have been on the C.B.C., all of these are carried on private stations. In connection with the programme for children, it is produced in co-operation with our Committee on the Sunday School and the home, and we have to have a series of stations all along the frontier, so in -- I am speaking from memory now, I think there are 27 stations carrying that programme. We are paying for the time on about 20 of them because we had to place them where we can reach the 6,000 children who are enrolled; the other two are being carried for us on sustaining time by the private stations.

MR. COYNE: Private stations in Toronto only or across the country?

DR. LONG: No, the programme for men is on more than one station in every province with the preponderance, I think, in the Maritime area, in the three Maritime provinces.

MR. COYNE: And this programme is carried by these stations on a sustaining basis?

DR. LONG: The programme for men and the "Good News" programme, as we call it, is sort of a morning devotion programme and is carried on sustaining time. I think I would like to say that we tried hard to get CJBC to take our "Good News" programme after they boosted Bruce Smith for the three hours in the morning, but it has not worked out that way.

MR. COYNE: CJBC is the second C.B.C.

station in Toronto?

DR. LONG: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Turning now to your section in which you commend the C.B.C. ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you leave this point, there is one question: On your own production you say:

"We have finished one series of T.V.

"programmes and have two more in process"?

DR. BEATON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you tell us what those programmes are about?

DR. BEATON: The first series of features of Dr. Archer Wallace, it was 14 minutes of almost straight talking. As you know, Dr. Archer Wallace has been more or less of a character in the United Church; he was for many years editor of our Youth Paper and has written 26 or 27 books that have been translated into seven languages and have sold over a million copies. That programme has been on six of the private T.V. stations and there are two more coming up the first of July. The answer we get from the C.B.C. so far is that they have not time, and when somebody asks the representatives of the churches whether they ought not to produce programmes and offer them to the C.B.C., I have the answer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just on this production, as a technical matter, these Dr. Archer Wallace programmes, do you actually produce films of these programmes, or do you merely produce the script and

have that recorded live or on film at the studios?

DR. LONG: We did not produce the Wallace programmes; we didn't have the studios that were adequate to do that. The ones that are in process now, we are doing ourselves.

THE CHAIRMAN: On film?

DR. LONG: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Have you arranged for the production of the Archer programmes through some other facilities in Toronto?

DR. LONG: Yes, we asked for estimates from firms in Canada and the United States, and they were eventually produced at Springfield, Massachusetts because the rate was about half the best rate we could get in Toronto.

MR. COYNE: Those are film programmes where you distribute them to the schools, or the 8 stations that are carrying them?

DR. LONG: Yes.

MR. COYNE: I was going to turn, Dr. Long, to page 4 of your brief: You commend the C.B.C. for refusing to extend the length of time in every hour that may be used for advertising, and you suggest the present situation is perfectly adequate and you say:

"In fact, a large proportion of our

"constituency would like to see the

"amount of advertising curtailed."

I just wanted to make sure that your intent there was that the amount of advertising should, perhaps,

be reduced, but you are not suggesting or taking the position that advertising should be eliminated altogether?

DR. LONG: We have a set-up all across the Church whereby we have radio and T.V. committees in conferences and our contacts with them through correspondence and in workshops indicates quite a lot of our people -- we are only speaking now for the active workers in the United Church -- are rather restive on the amount of advertising that does appear in connection with some sponsored programmes. We are not even suggesting that it be reduced, but that is just thrown in to give a little background for our conviction.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you leave that page -- and I am inclined to think this may be outside our terms of reference -- you say at the top that the Dominion Government should begin a campaign of temperance education through radio and television: Do you really feel that is a function of the Dominion Government?

DR. LONG: The Dominion Government does come into big revenues through taxation sources in this particular industry, but the Dominion Government must expend a great deal of money in remedial institutions in dealing with the economic problems which are created by this particular industry and by the habits of people related to it, and it is surely in the public interest that there should be a kind of temperance education which will alleviate

this. Social conditions which are the product of the use of alcohol are becoming aggravated. We feel it is a matter of social concern; it is a matter of concern for the welfare of our people as a whole that temperance should be taught.

THE CHAIRMAN: It may be, but why the Dominion Government?

DR. LONG: . In that the Dominion Government ought to be concerned with the welfare of the people.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, they have got certain statutory restrictions, of course. Your first argument about the fact that they collect a lot of money from this industry surely has no particular bearing? They collect a lot of money against the pulp and paper industry, but I would not like you to start a campaign against it.

DR. LONG: . The pulp and paper industry does not increase the number of people in our penal institutions.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are some arguments about that.

DR. LONG: . I think we cannot minimize the fact that there are very great attendant evils and a social problem of tremendous concern here, and with that social problem no other institution is able to deal strongly and in toto with it.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, but the field of social problems is fundamentally, with certain well-defined exceptions, not the responsibility of the

Dominion Government.

DR. LONG: : The Dominion Government is concerned in remedial measures about health, that is not unrelated to this. The tremendous number of alcoholics in Canada, which is becoming disproportionate, is one that has to be concerned at Governmental level. The more you think about it, the more you realize there must be concern on the part of the Dominion Government.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we cannot go too far with this, but there is a constitutional problem in this whole field.

DR. LONG: : That is quite true.

DR. BEATON: We didn't put it in here, but we had it before us at the time, and we might take a lead here from the C.B.C. schools broadcasts which are national, and yet education is a provincial matter. I don't need to go into the way in which they get over those difficulties by having an Advisory Committee and by dealing with the Departments of Education in each province, and so on, but it could be done in some such way as that. Some Provincial Governments would co-operate, and there are some who would not. We recognize here there is a question of provincial rights. Education is a provincial matter, but we would like to see the initiative come from somewhere, and we are talking today to the C.B.C.

MR. COYNE: On page 5 where you get to your comments and suggestions, the first one being with respect to The National Religious Advisory

Council now operates, and then you say:

"Outside of their purview and, in the
"main, outside of their advice, the
"G.B.C. is currently producing the
"following religious programmes:",

and you list them.

DR. LONG: Yes; that, I think, is a
correct statement.

MR. COYNE: I was going to ask whether
you thought that the fact that the National Religious
Advisory Committee was not consulted on these pro-
grammes had had any adverse effect on these programmes?
Are there matters in these programmes of which you
are critical which may not have occurred if the
National Religious Advisory Council had been consulted?

DR. LONG: Not necessarily. As I see
it, what we are pleading for here in all the discus-
sions we had in preparing this brief is that we
recognize the National Religious Advisory Council is
"american"; you take representatives of six denomina-
tions and put them together. I was on it for five
or six years, myself, and I know that what we had
this morning was a very mild demonstration of what
goes on in the meetings, and yet, through this whole
period they have been able to do a lot of wonderful
co-ordination in the field of religious broadcasting.
However, we are saying two things: First of all,
the men who are appointed now, nominated now by the
Churches to the National Religious Advisory Council,
are in the main ecclesiastics who are high up in their

own denominations and who know the ministers from coast to coast, and can therefore give advice as to who should broadcast and who should not, and when. What we would like to see is one of the two representatives from each denomination be a layman with practical experience in radio and television who can come at the problems which are presented with some technical experience and background. We think we are all off on the wrong foot in this religious broadcasting field. In every other department, radio and television is a lay proposition. You can mention any one you like, and the people who are heading it up are lay people, but when it comes to religion we take it for granted that nobody but preachers can do religious broadcasting or education over the air. We would like to see the National Religious Advisory Council sort of transformed in its membership.

MR. COYNE: This leads me into my next question which arose from the final sentence in this section of your brief where you say:

"We believe the time has come when
 "its influence on the religious
 "broadcasting policy of the whole
 "C.B.C. system should be enlarged
 "and diversified."

What I was going to suggest to you was this: We have heard considerable this morning about the National Religious Advisory Council and about the real successes which it has had in the field in which it is operating, and we have also been given

to understand, and you pointed it out, that it has operated within a relatively limited field. My question would be this: If you seek to extend the field in which you want the National Religious Advisory Council to operate, isn't there some danger that you may destroy this harmonious compromise that has developed, and perhaps generate a good deal of disharmony between the various denominational interests?

DR. LONG: I think that would be a calculated risk. From our standpoint the Chinese have an expression

大材小用 which

means: "Putting big timber to unimportant uses", and we feel that bringing 8 important ministers together for a whole afternoon once a month, and all they do is make out a list of preachers for the religious periods such as "Church of the Air", is not adequate; we are not getting as much out of this denominational co-operation as we ought to get.

THE CHAIRMAN: You think your representative is strong enough to stand a little more work?

DR. LONG: I would like to try it.

DR. BEATON: We are interested in this diversification. We feel there has been a tremendous development in the whole scope and development of religious broadcasting in the last ten or fifteen years, and it is quite time we tried newer things and better ways of reaching constituencies throughout

Canada. Obviously that will require a good deal of thinking, planning and negotiation, and perhaps compromise as we go along, and it is worth trying, but we won't try it until someone initiates that experiment, and we think the time has come to do it, and we trust one another sufficiently, and we have a backlog of goodwill on which to build, and we are willing to take the risk.

MR. COYNE: You feel the usefulness which this harmony lends to the C.B.C. could be continued even if it extended its operations?

DR. BEATON: Yes, I think they have shown they can overcome initial difficulties which were much greater than the ones I see ahead. I should like to say also that it was not an indication in the least that we criticized the content of these programmes which are here listed. We feel some of them are good experiments and are headed in the right direction, but we feel the co-operation of the Church groups can help the C.B.C. in enlarging and enriching this kind of programme. That is why we want to see the function of the National Religious Advisory Council at work.

MR. COYNE: You go on in your second recommendation to make certain suggestions with regard to the religious department of the C.B.C., and you compare the members of the staff presently employed not with the total number in the B.B.C., but with the number of ecclesiastical personnel the B.B.C. has. I was wondering whether you would agree

that the two Corporations as they function in their respective countries are not really comparable because of this reason, that the B.B.C. operates all broadcasting in Great Britain, whereas in Canada the C.B.C. only operates some broadcasting?

THE CHAIRMAN: This used to be true, but it is a little different now.

MR. COYNE: Well, I am not speaking of the independent television authority, but I don't think these people are either. For example, the C.B.C. staff is not the only staff concerned with religious broadcasting in this country; there are private stations.

DR. BEATON: None of them has any people devoting their time exclusively, or even largely, to religious broadcasting. The C.B.C. is preponderant in the Canadian scene. It is the only thing we have in Canada through which we can make any comparisons at all.

MR. COYNE: I agree, but the only point of my question was that if the C.B.C. does not perform the identical function in this country that the B.B.C. does, you cannot, perhaps, merely make a direct comparison and say that if there are 25 employed by the B.B.C. there should be 10 employed by the C.B.C.

DR. BEATON: That is quite true, but the fact still remains that the C.B.C. is in a dominant position, and it has a part-time Director with an assistant, whereas the B.B.C. which, after all,

covers a much smaller geographic area, nevertheless has to have a staff of some 11 professional people. Certainly, that would indicate a very great disproportion in staff, and in emphasis between the two systems. It is a rough yardstick, but it is an indication.

MR. COYNE: Purely as an indication.

DR. LONG: Oh yes, that is all.

MR. COYNE: Then, on your next section where you deal with the preservation of Canadian cultural heritage and patterns, the final section says:

"Nevertheless, the Canadian people must
"be safeguarded from the encroachments
"of this blatant materialism so evident
"in many United States programmes."

Do you feel it is being safeguarded now, or are you suggesting that there are certain steps which should be taken in this field which are not being taken at the present time?

DR. BEATON: When I watch my own children looking at T.V. from the Buffalo stations, I sometimes feel it is not being safeguarded well enough. I think we are doing a fair job, but I think here we are trying to say that Canadian Radio and T.V. must be constantly on the alert. They have a bigger job to do than they would have to do were we not cheek by jowl with such an overwhelming country as the United States happens to be. We believe there is a distinct Canadian heritage and we have distinct standards in our family life and in some other realms

of life which we ought to protect, and we have a contribution to make in the cultural life of the world, which cannot be made unless it is made overt and active through our broadcasting scene.

MR. COYNE: But this is a sort of flag that you are putting up?

DR. LONG: Yes.

MR. COYNE: You are not making any specific recommendations as to any things which should be done?

DR. LONG: No. Actually, we are trying to point out the tremendous importance of radio and television in this point.

THE CHAIRMAN: At this point I would like to ask you about an earlier reference which relates to this, on page 4 where you give some commendations. You say in No. 1, "for the harmonious arrangements with other networks, both British and American, to air the best of their programmes in Canada....."

Is that a matter of special study you have made, or is that merely an impression? I mean, this is one of the things that we must try to find out, insofar as through the C.B.C. mainly the American programmes are brought in. We don't know at the moment -- we have had no evidence at all -- as to whether they get the best of the programmes, whether they get the worst of them, or whether it is a mixed bag.

I wonder what is the basis for your statement here?

DR. BEATON: Well, we haven't actually done a survey on that, although I have done quite a bit of work on it personally. I have got five radios in my house and a T.V. set, and I am never, if I am at home, beyond reach of one of them. I have started to compile a list of the American programmes that I consider good, that are coming to us over the C.B.C. network, and I think that we could benefit very greatly in Canada by the contribution that they have to make.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is obvious. All I was dealing with was your statement that we are now getting the best of their programmes in Canada. I want to know what the basis for that statement is?

DR. BEATON: That might be a little too strong. Probably it should have been slightly milder than that. But we are getting a lot of good programmes both from the American networks and from the B.B.C.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you haven't made a specific study to appraise the selection that is being made?

DR. BEATON: No, we are not able to be dogmatic about it. I think the second sentence in that paragraph is equally important:

"We would like to see the C.B.C. a
 "little more aggressive in selling
 "our best programmes in ... the United
 "States ..."

I think we have got something else to export besides Wayne and Shuster, even although I listen to Wayne and

Shuster. There are a few of our programmes being heard in the States.

I go down to the Broadcasting and Film Commission and I meet men who are spending their lives in radio and T.V. I will give you an illustration. The Director of the Broadcasting and Film Commission ---

MR. COYNE : Where is that?

DR. BEATON: In New York.

... has a cottage on Lake Champlain, and he tells me that he dials his radio to CBM in Montreal when he arrives and no other station is tuned in for the duration of his six weeks -- which, I think, is a fair indication of the fact that we do have programmes that we ought to be trying to sell by way of exchange or otherwise in the United States. Then, we get letters continually about our programmes from Americans who are within range of our stations, where they are being broadcast, expressing appreciation of them.

MR. COYNE: Well, then, just going on, if I may, to page 8, I have two points, Dr. Long. The first one is on your paragraphs(c) and (d). You say that if there was a more adequate staff at the C.B.C. in the religious department one of the major contributions would be to supply leadership for radio and T.V. workshops in local areas.

Would you tell us what you have in mind when you use the phrase "radio and T.V. workshops in local areas"?

DR. LONG: Dr. Beaton has set up dozens of them. I think, perhaps, he should answer that.

DR. BEATON: What happens is this, that preachers in the local area and such lay people as will come are brought together for a period usually from Monday afternoon until Friday afternoon.

MR. COYNE: Is that interdenominational?

DR. BEATON: Yes. We bring in, say, a team of four, and one group majors in script writing and another group majors in production, and so on; and by the end of the five days everybody is required to have turned in a script of some kind and to have had it produced, even if it is only on a tape-recorder. We have had wonderful co-operation from the private stations and from the C.B.C. stations in local areas in the use of their facilities. At the most recent one in Ottawa they gave us three periods of 3 hours each in the T.V. studio, and our group actually produced two T.V. religious programmes. Those fellows have gone home with a different kind of feeling about what they can do. The need for it is amazing.

The most difficult business in this whole area of religious broadcasting is to sell the preachers on the idea that it is something that they ought to be concerned about and have a hand in.

MR. COYNE : You are speaking primarily here about local development at local level?

DR. BEATON: We haven't done anything on a national level yet. They are doing something on a national level in the United States of America.

MR. COYNE: My question would be this: Apart from the extension of the use of studios,

presumably at a time when they are not being required for actual programmes that are going out -- is that, properly, a field in which the C.B.C., as the national organization with national commitments, should expend funds and efforts? In other words, whatever funds the C.B.C. has they are going to be limited, and are you suggesting, or is it proper, that their funds and efforts should be devoted to something that, perhaps, is fundamentally local, apart, of course, from making available the use of local studio facilities that may be available?

DR. LONG: Canada is made up of a lot of small localities joined together, and you have to look at it from the point of view of people living together as a community. The C.B.C. can help not only by the use of studios, but also by letting us draw upon the experience of the personnel. You can't have such T.V. workshops or radio workshops without people who have experience, and there must be teachers as well as students in such workshops. We feel that both by providing facilities and also by providing leadership we ought to be able to draw upon the C.B.C., that it has a function to raise the level -- the standard -- of performance.

You can see a tremendous difference in the Maritimes, for instance, where there is a workshop, and where there is a great deal of difference in the attitude of the radio station itself, the people who work for it. There is a greater eagerness and awareness of the real possibility of

religious broadcasting on the part of the people of a whole area in the Maritimes. That sort of thing repeated across the country would have a tremendous influence.

DR. BEATON: This is not an idea which requires a tremendous amount of money. \$25,000 a year would go a long way if it were continued over a period of five years, to do the thing that we are pleading for.

MR. COYNE: You do regard it as the proper responsibility of the C.B.C., as I understand you, to endeavour to raise generally the standard of broadcasting, whether it be in the local sphere, or over their own stations, and private stations, or anywhere else.

DR. LONG: They are bound to interlock. If you raise the standards of performance in one you are bound to raise it in the other.

MR. COYNE: Just one final question. On page 9, in recommendation No. 3, you recommend that the C.B.C. regulations should be amended so that it is a condition of securing a license that private stations should extend to local churches the same privilege -- that is, the provision of free time. Are there any other spheres outside of religious broadcasting in which you feel it should also be a requirement that free time be provided by commercial stations? Why single out the religious field?

DR. BEATON: Because that is what we are dealing with.

DR. LONG: I don't think we have any mandate to speak for education or for other institutions; but we are concerned with the effects of religion in broadcasting.

MR. COYNE: You haven't given any particular consideration to the economics concerned, as to whether it may, or may not, be an economic proposition for private stations to be required to provide free time?

DR. LONG: Every station has some sustaining time, doesn't it, for the most part, and we feel that quite likely we would have, and that religion in the community should have, some share within that.

DR. BEATON: We wish, of course, to go on record as saying that this applies to a minority, and it is rather a small minority, of the private stations. Most of the private stations in this country are giving a substantial portion of sustaining time for religious broadcasts. In some cases it would be a bigger proportion in reference to their total organization than we have been offered as the C.B.C.'s contribution. But there are a few cases where ^{our} people locally and nationally have run into real difficulty on this issue.

MR. COYNE: It is those few cases that you are thinking of in respect of your recommendation?

DR. BEATON: Yes.

MR. COYNE: These are all my questions, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any questions,
Mr. Turcotte?

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: I asked my questions as I
noted them down, as we went along.

Thank you very much for your brief. We
will give it consideration.

---The hearings adjourned at 1.05 P.M. until 2.30 P.M.

--On resuming at 2.30 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: The first brief we are to hear this afternoon is that of the Southam Press Limited to be presented by Mr. St. Clair Balfour and if you wish to bring any of your associates with you Mr. Balfour, to the table please do so.

MR. BALFOUR: Mr. Chairman --

THE CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

MR. BALFOUR: Mr. Chairman I would like to introduce Mr. W. Watson Southam, Vice-President of the Southam Company, who is associated with me in the presentation of this brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will begin by marking the brief Exhibit 118. That is the first thing we always do, and the second usually is for me, at the opening of each half days session to repeat a short description of our procedure, which is to have the brief read or outlined so that we have it recalled to our minds and so that there is some understanding with the rest of the public that are hear today as to what is in the brief and then we have questions which are as searching and as detailed as we can make them. They are made solely for the purpose of getting at the facts and do not indicate any opinion by the Commission. Will you proceed from there, Mr. Balfour, please?

MR. BALFOUR: With your permission I will read our brief and I would also, after reading the brief like to reply to a charge which has been

levelled against my Company by the Canadian Congress of Labour in its brief. I would like to rebut it, if I may.

This brief is submitted by the Southam Company Limited. It has for many years owned Canadian newspapers which are editorially independent units. It has a minority interest in two television properties. It does not own or control any. We consider it proper that we should stress what we feel are the essential bonds between the Press and radio or television broadcasting. These involve liberty of expression and efficiency in reporting and disseminating of news.

This ground we know has been gone over frequently, and some of our contentions may appear to be repetitious. The reason is not that we feel any need to re-emphasize what many radio and television groups have been suggesting to Government. However, we have much in common, and we feel there are still rather dangerous misconceptions of freedom of speech and the Press, Canadian culture, and encouragement of talent.

The first and most familiar point often stressed in briefs and arguments about the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's role in broadcasting is that as a medium of mass communication it engages both as a competitor, and as a censor of other media in the same field. In the final disciplinary resort, it acts as both prosecutor and judge.

In the following argument we wish to discuss two points:-

1. The present authority of the CBC.
2. The restrictions now limiting multiple ownership.

We submit that the regulation of radio and television stations should be recognized as falling into three divisions.

a) The technical process of the regulation of the use of wave lengths and the issue of licences.

b) The control of news and advertising contained in programs.

c) The promotion of Canadian culture and the encouragement of native talent.

We believe the regulation of licensing and the technical aspects of broadcasting and telecasting should rest with the Department of Transport with respect to publicly and privately owned stations without representation from the CBC with reference to private stations.

The Aird Commission of 1929 urged a national government monopoly. What appeared in the days of the Aird inquiry to be the main restriction was the relatively few broadcasting channels available. American engineers, as was pointed out in the special parliamentary inquiry into broadcasting in 1952 and 1953, made a statement in 1933 that the United States could not provide channels for more than

600 AM stations. Nevertheless, by 1952 there were over 2,000 AM stations operating in the U.S., and the FM band infinitely more extensive, had hardly been touched. At any rate the limitation of channels in any frequency band is essentially a technical one that could be regulated by a body similar to the Board of Transport Commissioners.

When the CBC endeavours to impose its opinions on programs on the private stations, let us pause a moment to conceive the possibility that the CBC may be wrong in its judgment in respect to culture. There is probably greater safety and greater chance of development by promoting the independent operations of others in the field. The worst mistakes of all are the mistakes of the monopolists.

Let us for a minute, while accepting the lack of similarity in production, imagine a newspaper counterpart of the CBC; such a body would have the power to say what would go in or what would not go in the columns of competing Canadian newspapers; it could force them to publish certain percentages of material it chose, and fit this in with advertising. It could order suspension of publication as an ultimate penalty. It could allocate newsprint. No newspaper could start an operation without its sanction. We would refer to the Canadian Broadcasting Act Revised Statutes of Canada, Clause 21, Chapter 32.

To quote these restrictions, simply substituting "newspaper" for "Radio" exemplifies the

the nature of what we consider to be the basic objection of the governing principle of the present law.

Here it is:

(21) (1) The Canadian Newspaper Publishing Corporation may make regulations.

a) to control the establishment and operation of chains of networks of "newspapers" in Canada;

b) to prescribe the space to be reserved periodically by any private "newspaper" for the publishing of material of the Corporation;

c) to control the character of any and all material published by Corporation or private "newspapers":

d) to determine the proportion of space that may be devoted to advertising in any publication of the Corporation or in private "newspapers", and to control the character of such advertising.

e) to prescribe the proportion of space that may be devoted to political news by the Corporation and by private "newspapers", and to assign such space on an equitable basis to all parties and rival candidates;

f) to promote and ensure the greater use of Canadian talent by Corporation and private

"newspapers";

g) requiring licensees of private "newspapers" to furnish to the Corporation such information in regard to their news activities as the Corporation considers necessary for the proper administration of this Act.

We realize, as we said before, that the production processes are quite different, but we believe basic similarity of principles involved far and away outweighs any technical variations.

"Freedom of speech and press", as the 1947 Hutchins Commission in the U.S. put it, "is close to the central meaning of all liberty. Where men cannot freely convey their thoughts to one another no other liberty is secure. Where freedom of expression exists the germ of a free system is already present and a means is at hand for every extension of liberty."

This can hardly be reconciled with the assertion of a Royal Commission Report in Canada that:

"The only status of private broadcasters is as part of the national broadcasting system. They have no civil rights to broadcast or any new property rights in broadcasting. They have been granted in the national interests a privilege over their fellow citizens."

Surely when Government becomes the chief arbiter of dissemination of published material under the claim it is in the "public interest" to

so regulate it, we approach a monopoly that overshadows all others.

Absolutism in any branch of Government could be hypothetically benevolent; yet it is a first principle of democracy that absolutism in itself is an absolute evil and any approach to it is full of danger. This could invoke the charge that many of our newspapers are monopolies. This charge confirms rather than weakens warning against Government regulation of mass communication media. For no matter how great the power of a newspaper is, unless tied to political power it cannot interfere with a citizen's basic freedom.

The freedom of the Press is after all a great negative. It is not a gospel of specific liberties, it is a foundation of iron rules to protect an individual from having his rights threatened or taken away from him. It may define what can't be said; never what should be said.

If such a publication is to be regulated beyond the great premise of democratic law, which is in essence a protective law for the individual, then such a regulation becomes an invasion of and endangers liberty.

In suggesting that private stations be free from coercion with respect to culture we feel confident they can be counted on to make contributions in their own way. Newspapers have voluntarily made many contributions to the public

welfare.

The Royal Commission of 1949-1951 was concerned with the educational and cultural aspects of broadcasting, the most precarious terrain of all. We would be the first to salute the achievement of the CBC in helping Canada's cultural development through its radio and television programs. It was largely from its corps of actors, actresses, and singers that Stratford, the Canadian Ballet, and the Canadian Opera originated with the CBC in its earlier radio broadcasts. It is our hope that the CBC may have the funds and facilities needed for an ever-broadening growth along these splendid lines. Nevertheless, it is worth warning that to try and impose a loosely-defined culture on the public through a set-up policed by the CBC as it now stands could create wide antagonism, for good reason. Our feeling is that the CBC should give Canadians the privilege of viewing first class material they could not obtain from commercial broadcasting outlets; but that the latter should in no way be restricted in the type of material they wish to use.

We would say that such a corporation as the CBC should be substantially financed to assure the people of this country the type of educational material and entertainment that would at least give them an opportunity to turn to it as an alternative to the popular commercial broadcasts.

Culture, to use the word loosely, cannot be forced on listeners. Nor should it be arbitrarily inserted into commercial broadcasts by Government direction. Major investigations of the press, like that in England in 1946, always come to the inescapable conclusion that neither quality nor integrity mean much if a publication is neither going to be listened to nor read.

This brings us to the difficult question of the quality of programs. Just as the government which governs least is taken to govern best, so that government which censors and regulates least does the most to stimulate free expression. The best radio and television censor is the householder with his dial and the less interference with the privilege we have, the closer do we come to democratic principles in broadcasting. For no matter how we might criticize the commercial tendencies of radio and television, just as we often stress deceptiveness of catch-cries in elections, there is no dodging the peril of any alternative dictated by government.

The second point to which we wish to direct the attention of the Commissioners is that of multiple ownership. As set forth in section 32 (3) 9d) of General Radio Regulations under the Radio Act as published in the Canada Gazette of January 26th, 1955, it states that private commercial broadcasting station licences are

are subject to the following, amongst other conditions, viz:-

"(d) Except with the permission of the Minister given upon the recommendation of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation no person shall be licensed to operate more than one station and no licence shall be issued to or held by a company owned or controlled by a company holding a licence or to a company owing or controlling a company holding a licence;"

We submit this regulation is unsound and that there is not valid sociological reason for such a prohibition. The heavy costs of labour and material in acquiring, collating and disseminating programs under present conditions are such that only sound and well-financed organizations are able to undertake and carry through the work involved in so doing. It is also an undoubted fact that a financially weak organization is more susceptible to external influences and pressures than an organization which is strongly financed and experienced in dealing with such pressures.

Under the present regulation, anyone who has, by successfully operating a radio or television broadcasting station, proved his ability in this field of mass communication, is automatically penalized by his very success. This is illogical.

Multiple ownership should be subject only to such restrictions as the Combines Act

specifies.

To suggest that multiple ownership is a comparable danger to political control of telecommunications seems to us untenable.

The Southam Company has been recently refused permission by the CBC to expand its interest in radio. In April, 1955, it applied to the CBC for approval of the transfer by purchase of the shares of the International Broadcasting Company, New Westminster, B.C. (CKNW) to it. This was refused on the grounds that under section 32 (3) (d) of the regulations under the Radio Act multiple ownership is not permitted.

In 1956 a group headed by F.A. Griffiths of Vancouver made an offer to purchase the above mentioned shares. Because of his knowledge of the previous offer by the Southam Company Mr. Griffiths invited it to take down a minority interest (40%)

On March 28th, 1956, the transfer of the shares was approved subject to the elimination of the Southam Company interest.

In August, 1954, the Southam Company Limited, in conjunction with station CHED made application for a television licence in Edmonton. The application represented two of the three local radio stations and offered to include the third, CFRN in an equal partnership.

Notwithstanding the fact that in our brief we undertook to provide a more powerful better equipped station than the other applicant, and had been in business in Edmonton many years longer, it was granted to him.

We again point out that the Southam Company does not own or control any television stations.

We return to our basic contention which is that existing laws against sedition, treason, defamation, blasphemy, obscenity, false advertising and misbranding should cover the Press and Radio and Television equally without prejudice on the part of any governing body, and that multiple ownership should be subject only to the limitations of the Act respecting Combines.

We respectfully recommend for your consideration that:-

1. The regulation of licensing and the technical aspects of radio and television should rest with the Department of Transport with respect to publicity and privately owned stations without representation from the CBC with reference to private stations.

2. That radio and television programs should be subject only to the existing laws against sedition, treason, libel, slander, false advertising and misbranding without prejudice on

the part of any governing body.

3. That the promotion of Canadian culture should continue to be furthered by the CBC and that this should be financed if necessary from the general revenues of the country.

4. That multiple ownership should be subject only to such restrictions as the Combines Act specifies.

All of which is respectfully submitted, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, the other point you wanted to cover?

MR. BALFOUR: Right, sir. I would just like to say in connection with our previous brief that incase there is any doubt in your mind as to what we mean by saying that the press and radio and television should be subject to existing laws against sedition, etc., without prejudice on the part of any governing body, we mean they should be subject to these laws as enforced by the Courts of the land without interference on the part of any governing body.

We have said in the brief that we hold a controlling interest in two radio stations. I would like to point out that in both these markets there are other competing radio stations. Of the two television stations in which we have a minority interest one is in a market reached by four or five

competing stations, in the other city it is the only station but there are other channels available.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is Edmonton?

MR. BALFOUR: That is Calgary, sir.

Whether or not our individual operations have direct local competition in their particular field of mass communications, they are not alone and do face strong and active competition from other mass communication media. Our mass communications media are strongly competitive and must live by the free choice of the public which they serve.

In a brief submitted to your Commission on April 15th, 1956, by the Canadian Labour Congress, the following statements were made:

"We wish to draw to your attention the development in private broadcasting which we think is wholly undesirable and certainly not in the public interest. This is the ghost of monopoly control of local publishing and broadcasting facilities; and of 'chains' of broadcasting stations. The following examples taken from information we believe to be reliable, will show the extent of this development: In Hamilton, Ontario the Southam Publishers own the Spectator and have an interest

"in the television station CHCH-TV. In Calgary, Alberta, the Southam Publishers own the Herald, the radio station CFAC and have an interest in the television station CHCT-TV."

This brief also mentions London, St. John, Sherbrooke, Peterborough. Also mentions Kingston and St. John's, Newfoundland, as being similar.

It is important in this connection to note that Kingston, Peterborough, Hamilton, Regina, London and St. John are 'one-paper cities'. We think that monopolies of this sort should not be allowed to develop, and where they have, they should be broken up. We hold this view even though Press freedom might never be interfered with by those who own and control the monopoly. However, at least in one instance this interference has occurred. This was beyond my field. In rebuttal may I point out that in Hamilton our interest in CHCH-TV is a minority and that both the Spectator and CHCH-TV are subject to active competition from outside centres, and that there are two locally operated radio stations in which we have no interest and an application has been filed for a third.

In Calgary, there is a competing newspaper. There are two competing radio stations and an application has been filed for a third. There are other television channels available. The point I would like to make is that a distinction should be drawn between the control of all the units, the three mass communication media under discussion in a particular centre, and the ownership of a unit of each of the three, any one or more of which may compete with other similar media in a particular field. I think perhaps I would go further and say there is also a distinction between

them and a so-called monopoly which results from restriction by Government of the available wave-length in a particular area.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you repeat the first distinction again?

MR. BALFOUR: The point I would like to make is a distinction should be drawn between the control of all the units of the three mass communication

(continued on Page 2809)

media under discussion, newspaper, radio, and television, in a particular centre. I mean by one Company and the ownership of a unit of each of the three types any one or more of which may compete with other similar media in a particular field. I am endeavouring to draw a distinction between a single ownership of newspaper, radio, and television in a city where there are no other newspapers or radio stations or television stations and the ownership of one or more joint ownership of one or more of those media where there are also independent competing newspapers or radio or television stations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you make the distinction anything more than one of degree, is it a fundamental distinction?

MR. BALFOUR: I think it is a fundamental distinction. I think we have been charged in these two cities of being in the position of a monopoly. I submit we are not. I submit that there is competition and there could be competition, and as against a situation where, for one reason or another, there is no competition whatever in these three media.

THE CHAIRMAN: Take the case we have been told that Peterborough is owned by the newspaper, the radio station and the television station all owned by the same people. We have been told, we haven't got this positive -- now I think in Edmonton you own and operate the only newspaper?

MR. BALFOUR: Right, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: You also own a radio station?

MR. BALFOUR: Right, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you control that one.

MR. BALFOUR: We control a radio station, one of the three in Edmonton. There is competition.

THE CHAIRMAN: And in Edmonton you have not got the television station ?

MR. BALFOUR: No, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: So your point is if in any one of the three media there is some competition, it ceases to be monopolistic?

MR. BALFOUR: I will submit that, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: That was your point.

MR. BALFOUR: Yes.

MR. STEWART: Coming down to the instance you gave of Peterborough --

MR. BALFOUR: I didn't give Peterborough.

MR. STEWART: No, but we were talking about Peterborough. It is a one-newspaper town and the radio station and television presumably is controlled by the same medium, the newspaper people. Is it not the case that other radio stations from outside can reach into Peterborough?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes, sir, and I think I might add there there are other channels available, at least in radio.

MR. STEWART: Leaving it as it is right now where these three media of communications are in one hand, it is nevertheless the case that radio at least can reach into Peterborough from other parts of the Province.

MR. BALFOUR: Yes, sir, and I think you will find, if you examine the circulation record of the Toronto papers, you will find considerable circulation of the Toronto papers.

MR. STEWART: I would think that.

MR. BALFOUR: I will just continue. I do not think in either case it is fair or accurate to place the onus on newspapers, as has been done by the Canadian Labour Congress; and on behalf of my Company I would deny that our position as cited is in any way against the public interest, or tending towards the creation of a monopoly control of local broadcasting or publishing facilities in either Hamilton or Calgary.

It has also been suggested to you that newspapers should not be allowed to run radio or television broadcasting stations. The Special Committee on Broadcasting of the House of Commons in 1947 made this recommendation:

"We have this year given consideration to the question and we report we do not think newspapers should be treated in any different manner than other applicants for broadcasting licenses."

Broadcasting, whether radio or television, is merely an additional and alternative means of mass communication. It is a part of the Press, it is a newer technique, but basically the same business.

To deny publishers of printed and distributed publications the right to make use of the newer tech-

niques is merely to prevent them from making use of newer and different techniques to carry on their business in a changing, developing and improving world.

This is an arbitrary and unjust discrimination in connection with the merits of the individual applicant and against the best interest of the public to be served. It seems to me that the defence against the charge of monopoly is to open the available channels to applicants who are Canadian citizens of good character and to let the comparative chips fall where they may.

In only one or two cities, Toronto is perhaps one, are there likely to be fewer available TV channels than there may be applicants. Elsewhere there could be adequate local competition. As far as radio is concerned I understand there are channels available and no artificial monopoly exists, if indeed one does.

May I repeat that all privately-owned mass communications media are competing for and must live by the free choice of the public which they serve.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to add anything to this statement, Mr. Southam?

MR. SOUTHAM: No, I haven't anything to add, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Balfour, in the introductory part of your brief on the first page, you say: "We consider it proper that we should stress what we feel are the essential bonds between the Press and Radio or Television broadcasting. These involve liberty of expression and efficiency in reporting and dissem-

inating of news." And then in the third paragraph you say, referring to the rather conflicting points of view that arise from this argument as to the CBC's role, you say: "The first and most familiar point often stressed in briefs and arguments about Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's role in broadcasting is that as a medium of mass communication it engages both as a competitor, and as a censor of other media in the same field."

Do you regard that as being an accurate statement of the CBC's role at the present time?

MR. BALFOUR: Sir, it has the power so to do, and as the Government having that power within the law it does have that effect on stations, I do believe.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not what you say, you say it engages both as competitor and censor.

MR. BALFOUR: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, can you give me an example of it engaging a censor?

MR. BALFOUR: I am not an operator of a radio station, sir, but I understand, for instance, there are regulations governing certain types of advertising which may appear on radio. There are regulations governing the amount of advertising which may appear, spot announcements, I understand.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you call that censorship?

MR. BALFOUR: I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would not have thought that was the meaning of the word "censor".

MR. BALFOUR: I think that the control -- either by "must" or "must not" is a form of censorship. Now a "must" is the instruction of the CBC, for instance, that it expects a station to carry certain news programmes. The station might have its own news programme. I think that is censorship of the news. I don't suggest that the operators of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation are not presenting proper news in this thing, but I am suggesting they are telling the individual stations what they must, in fact, say.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a law which says you must put a certain kind of marking, a label, on a jug. Is that censorship?

MR. BALFOUR: I would not say that is censorship, sir. I do say that at 11 o'clock at night when you say you will carry the National news broadcast and shall not carry your own is censorship.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose it comes from the meaning of the word. I must have a look at the dictionary meaning of the word "censor".

MR. STEWART: Newspaper men have told me there is nothing so stale as an old newspaper. News must go on the air or in a newspaper when it is news. Has the CBC ever tried to interfere with any of the news before it goes over the air?

MR. BALFOUR: As I say, I am not an operator and not in a position to answer that. I have no suggestion. I have no personal knowledge of that. The CBC, I believe, gets its news, its national news and international news through Broadcast News, which

is a subsidiary of Canadian Press. I would think that possibly the management of Broadcast News would be in a better position to answer that. I do not charge that the CBC has interfered with any specific news item. I do not know.

MR. COYNE: Well, I have asked that specific question of private station operators as to whether or not the CBC ever in any respect directed or influenced or attempted to direct or influence what they put in their own news broadcast and the answer was a categorical "no". In a number of representative cases. Do I gather from what you say as to the National News Bulletin and the fact that the CBC depends upon private stations in some areas for the dissemination of its National service, do you suggest that there should be no National News Bulletin?

MR. BALFOUR: I don't suggest that, I suggest there should be no compulsion on private stations to carry it.

MR. COYNE: That is the National News Bulletin should only be available in those areas where the CBC has its own operating outlets and not available to the citizens in most parts of the country where the CBC depends on private stations.

MR. BALFOUR: I said there should be no compulsion on the private stations to carry it.

MR. COYNE: You may assume that they would all carry it as a matter of individual decision, but one cannot count on that. Presumably if it is desirable that this National Service should reach the

community generally, you have to have some power to insist that the persons who are able to disseminate it will do so.

MR. BALFOUR: Who is to say that it is desirable?

MR. COYNE: You just said yourself you thought the National News Bulletin from the CBC was desirable.

MR. BALFOUR: I have no objection to it, quite correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: On the same point, Mr. Balfour, Section 8 of the Broadcasting Act says the Corporation shall carry on a national broadcasting service within Canada.

MR. BALFOUR: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now the way it has been put to us is that this job of carrying on the National Broadcasting Service has in fact been done not as it was perhaps contemplated by the Aird Commission, which was to nationalize all radio broadcasting, but by, and as one brief put it, a unique Canadian system, different to any place else in the world whereby the CBC operated some stations in some localities and operated through private stations as part of the system in other localities. If on your contention that the CBC or a government body of the time, it is not just the CBC, in your contention you do not care whether it is the CBC or a separate regulatory body, do you?

MR. BALFOUR: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: In your contention the Government should not do this, but you are really saying that

the Corporation should not carry on a national broadcasting service within Canada?

MR. BALFOUR: No, sir, I don't think so. I do not think it should not carry on, I think we have said in our brief that it should.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well then, in order to do that and to be sure of doing it, it would be compelled at public expense to achieve the full coverage by its own stations?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: And therefore, do you accept the notion that there is a function, that of providing the National Broadcasting Service, then your contention comes down to saying that should be done solely through their own operated stations?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Would you add this, that it could be done through private outlets in those areas where the C.B.C. does not have public outlets if those private outlets agreed on their own, as a matter of their own decision, to carry all or a certain portion of the C.B.C.?

MR. BALFOUR: That is right, I would like to remove the compulsion.

MR. COYNE: But following the Chairman's question, if it was not possible to make voluntary arrangements in some community with the private stations, then the only alternative would be for the C.B.C., if they wanted their material broadcast in that area, to establish a station of

their own?

MR. BALFOUR: There is perhaps another alternative and that is to buy time on that private station for the programmes which the C.B.C. wish to broadcast in that particular area.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you through on that point?

MR. COYNE: Yes, I am.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are one or two other questions here. I have been asking this question before, you make a pretty direct statement where you say the C.B.C. engages both as competitor and as censor, can you tell me whether in your opinion the C.B.C. is a competitor of the private stations?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes, sir, it is a competitor for the advertising dollar for one thing and it is a competitor for the listening audience for another.

(Page 2819 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: What advertising?

MR. BALFOUR: The CBC sells time.

THE CHAIRMAN: It does not compete with the local advertising dollar, does it, on radio?

MR. BALFOUR: I again am not an operator, and I cannot answer that question.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have been told -- that was going to be my next question -- we have been told the CBC does not compete on radio at the local level.

MR. BALFOUR: I cannot answer that.

THE CHAIRMAN: In view of your earlier discussion, this being a completely separate statement, I was going to ask you whether you think they ought to compete with the present private stations at the local level.

MR. BALFOUR: If it was fair competition I would think it would have to.

THE CHAIRMAN: The other thing, that is at the local level of advertising -- this is radio only -- then it has been suggested to us, we have been told that for national advertising of a network variety, there is only the CBC that is operating networks.

MR. BALFOUR: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: So therefore there is no competition for the network dollar. I am trying to find out whether this competition exists, and just "having to compete for the advertising dollar", it is a pretty loose phrase.

MR. BALFOUR: There is no network, sir. But I understand from my colleagues in the radio

business there could be a network, competing network, if it were permissible. I think only one -- you go on, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am only saying you are not talking about what was desirable; you are talking about what is a fact. You are saying it engages as a competitor, and I am trying to find out why there is competition.

MR. BALFOUR: There are so many advertising dollars; the CBC engages in competition for an audience, and for a share of that advertising dollar.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you say in your definition of "competition" that the CBC was competing with the Hamilton Spectator?

MR. BALFOUR: Very definitely.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is that sense in which it is a competitor. It is not competing for the market, for the same kind of commodity, is it?

MR. BALFOUR: It is competing with radio stations for the market, for the same kind of commodity, in my opinion.

THE CHAIRMAN: If they do not sell -- if they do not compete in local advertising, and they cannot compete in network advertising, where is the competition?

MR. BALFOUR: They can compete in national -- not so necessarily on network. They could compete, if the restrictions were not there they could compete. I mean, private stations could compete. It can't now.-- for a network.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any examples on

the next sentence, "It acts as both prosecutor and judge"?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes. The CBC decides that a specific station may carry, must carry, a certain programme. If it does not, it can invoke penalties. It says a certain station may carry so much spot advertising. If it exceeds that limit, it can invoke penalties. It seems to me that the power is absolute in the law. It may not be necessary for the CBC to punish, and it may not yet have punished, I don't know, but the power to punish is there, and most of us tend to obey the law.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the reason I have asked all these questions is that this is a fundamental point that has been raised many times, and I want to be sure we are getting the exact, precise recommendation that is being put forward.

MR. SOUTHAM: May I just interject a remark there on this question of competition? You know, and we all know, that not only the CBC but private stations carry these so-called soap operas. Well, that is one aspect of the situation where the CBC is competing for the soap companies' advertising dollar. That is not on a network; that is a recording of some sort.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes, but on the other hand, if that soap company wished, couldn't they advertise through the various local stations, if they felt that was the better way?

MR. SOUTHAM: They do that, sir, but the

CBC also takes some of that business.

MR. COYNE: Going on to your first point at the bottom of the page, control of licensing, you say:

"We believe the regulation of licensing and the technical aspects of broadcasting and tele-casting should rest with the Department of Transport with respect to publicly and privately owned stations without representation from the CBC with reference to private stations."

I am just wondering what you meant by that final phrase. Do you mean if a private applicant comes to the Department of Transport for a licence, the CBC should not be permitted to be represented and to attend at the hearing?

MR. BALFOUR: No, sir. I mean the CBC should not be the authority. The CBC as it is now.

MR. COYNE: Perhaps it should read "without recommendation to the CBC with reference to private stations".

MR. BALFOUR: I do not think we do mean "recommendation". We mean representation. We do not see why the CBC should be involved in the issue of licences.

MR. COYNE: Trying to envisage the type of procedure you have in mind, presumably the Department of Transport would hold a hearing and

a private applicant for a licence would appear in support of his application?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes.

MR. COYNE: I presume also any other interested body or member of the public would also be entitled to be represented and heard?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes.

MR. COYNE: And the CBC would presumably be included in that category that would be entitled to be heard?

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me put it another way, Mr. Balfour. Supposing the other radio station in Hamilton was wanting to increase its power to such a point that it would in fact blot out your station?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: In Hamilton.

MR. BALFOUR: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you not want to make representation?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why should not the CBC have the right to make representations, too?

MR. BALFOUR: The CBC at present is the whole court. Now, if the CBC as an operator, an operating unit, with no governing body, as the C.N.R. as against the C.P.R., is going to appear before the Board of Transport Commissioners, I do not think we could object to the specific case.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Balfour, that is what you say. You say, "We believe the regulation of

licensing and the technical aspects of broadcasting and telecasting should rest with the Department of Transport with respect to publicly and privately owned stations without representation from the CBC with reference to private stations".

MR. BALFOUR: Yes, sir. In the case of Calgary, where at the moment there are three radio stations, and I understand an application for a fourth, there is no CBC station, and if it were being settled by the Department of Transport commissioners, I see no reason why the CBC should make representations in that particular case as an operator.

MR. COYNE: I am trying to envisage this revised procedure. I suppose it follows if the CBC were to be excluded from being a party to be heard at a proceeding of this kind, then where the CBC was making an application for a licence to operate a CBC owned station, there would be no reason why any representatives of the private broadcasters should be there?

MR. BALFOUR: I do not think that is a fair assumption. I have suggested that in Calgary where the CBC is not at present represented they should not intervene. If they were going into Calgary to establish a station I would think it would be only right and proper that the other Calgary stations would have the right to appear.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Are we talking at cross purposes here? It says in Section 22 of the Broadcasting Act that before dealing with any

application for licence -- the Minister of Transport is the actual person who issues the licence -- and before dealing with any application, the Corporation, the CBC, shall make recommendations to the minister. You object to their being asked for a recommendation, surely not against their appearing there?

MR. BALFOUR: If they have an interest, certainly they should appear.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it fair, Mr. Balfour, then to say "without recommendation" rather? You say "without representation from the CBC", making it completely absolute. You are not going to allow the CBC to make representations at all in any case the way it now reads. Surely you don't mean that?

MR. BALFOUR: Not in every case.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I think if you change that word back to "recommendation" from "representation", perhaps it would carry a better meaning of what you intend?

MR. BALFOUR: I shall look at it and take your suggestion under advisement, sir.

MR. COYNE: Then you go on to emphasize the technical nature, and your final sentence at the top of page 2:

"At any rate the limitation of channels in any frequency band is essentially a technical one that could be regulated by a body similar to the Board of Transport Commissioners."

Now, my question is this: surely if you adopt the

principle that there should be a national broadcasting service and there should be provision for dissemination across the country, doesn't the matter of limitation of channel cease to be wholly a technical one? If the national broadcasting service requires channels and should be able to have channels for the purpose of disseminating its service across the country, then the allocation of channels, does it not, become a matter of policy as well as a matter of a technical nature? Would you agree with that?

MR. BALFOUR: I still think it is a technical problem to decide who shall get what channel and at what power.

MR. COYNE: Supposing the CBC or the national broadcasting service is not operating a station in some particular area, and in accordance with your suggestion, was endeavouring to make arrangements with the local stations to enable the people in that area to hear this national service -- which according to national policy was a desirable thing -- and it was not able to get anywhere. The local stations were not agreeable to carrying these, and the number of channels available in that area was limited. Now, wouldn't it be a reasonable proposition that one of those channels, whether occupied by a private station or not, should be made available to the national broadcasting service in order that the people in that area should be able to receive it?

MR. BALFOUR: Who is to decide that, Mr Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Well, let us say the Department of Transport decides it?

MR. BALFOUR: That is the Government. The Government decides that they wish to expropriate or preempt a channel.

MR. COYNE: The real point of my question is, is the matter of channel allocation in circumstances of that kind purely a technical one, or are there policy considerations that enter into it; namely whether the people of that area should have access to the CBC or not?

MR. BALFOUR: That certainly could be. As I say, it is a question of expropriation by Parliament.

MR. COYNE: Yes.

MR. BALFOUR: As with any public body requiring land, or any other facility in this country. The Hydro needs the banks of the St. Lawrence, and they had them expropriated by the Government. If they wish to take something from me, it is presumably the same thing.

MR. COYNE: That is true, it is not wholly a purely technical matter.

MR. BALFOUR: I think it is, Mr. Coyne. I think we have two different things. I think we have the technical aspects of wave lengths, and the channels and the powers.

MR. COYNE: Yes, and the matter of national policy, which is a matter for the Government in this country, and I do not think they necessarily interlock, I think the Government of this country could

say, "We want a station in Calgary", and the Department of Transport could say, "What is there we would have to expropriate or whatever remedy, with compensation". I do think there is a difference between policy and the technical aspects of this problem. You might agree both factors could enter into the matter of the use of these channels.

MR. BALFOUR: I think national policy could enter into the use of the specific channel.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you have a national policy to this effect, doesn't it have to enter into it?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes, sir. If it is Parliament, it must be.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a point which is really one of the few ones on which you can be definite. In the Order in Council it says:

"The reconsideration of television broadcasting should be based upon the principles that the grant of the exclusive use of certain frequencies or channels for broadcasting shall continue to be under the control of the Parliament of Canada."

MR. COYNE: Dealing now with your next section, control of news and advertising, you say:

"When the CBC endeavours to impose its opinions on programmes on the private stations . . ."

Let us pause a moment and concede the possibility the CBC may be wrong, when you say "the CBC endeavours to

impose its opinions on programmes", have you anything specifically in mind as far as present practice is concerned? You have mentioned regulations affecting advertising, both the amount and the content in certain circumstances. As a matter of practice today, is the programming by private stations dominated by the imposition of CBC opinion on its programmes? Is there a specific restriction on the freedom of the programme as it sees fit?

MR. BALFOUR: There are restrictions on certain times which the CBC requires for the promulgation of certain CBC programmes.

MR. COYNE: That is with regard to reserved time on stations that are affiliated with the CBC network. I would think that is a matter of network arrangement. There must be a similar arrangement in the United States, for example, respecting network. But apart from that, and of course, there are a number of stations not affiliated with any CBC network, is it your impression there is a substantial imposition by the CBC of its opinion of what programmes those stations should carry, or are you more concerned about some possibility that has in fact not matured yet?

MR. BALFOUR: I am concerned with both. I think any unilateral imposition of a control or reservation of time is wrong, and I am concerned lest this be abused, not necessarily by the present CBC, but the right to abuse is there.

MR. COYNE: You have not any specific

actual abuses in mind at the present time?

MR. BALFOUR: Once again, I am not an operator, and that is a programming question.

MR. COYNE: You would perhaps admit it may be so?

MR. BALFOUR: It may be so.

MR. COYNE: It may be so that there are no abuses of the kind we have been speaking of?

MR. BALFOUR: I do know they do reserve times, that it is done unilaterally, and it is an inconvenience at least to certain stations at certain times.

(Page 2831 follows)

MR. COYNE: Apart from the reserved times, as far as you know, they are not interfering in the sense of directing what an unaffiliated private stations wants to put on the air with the exception of advertising?

MR. BALFOUR: In the case of the Hamilton television station we carried our own news broadcast at eleven o'clock at night. The CBC wished the national news to be put on at eleven o'clock at night. We had already sold that time and, of course, we had to cancel the contract. I don't know whether we had to do it, but the CBC telephoned us and our manager had some interviews with them, and he received a letter saying, "We expect you to", and we did, sir.

MR. COYNE: What you would say is that in that situation if the CBC wants to see that the people of Hamilton and area receive the national news, it should set up its own station and not impose itself on your station?

MR. BALFOUR: I submit it should be by negotiation and not unilateral, and it is unilateral.

MR. COYNE: Supposing the negotiations didn't get anywhere?

MR. BALFOUR: Well, that is it. In the case of Hamilton the CBC's Toronto station is perfectly visible in Hamilton.

MR. COYNE: You say so.

MR. BALFOUR: I live there.

MR. COYNE: You are saying the people of Hamilton don't need this service, and I may say the

same thing, but there may be another viewpoint.

MR. BALFOUR: I am saying I don't like anybody, any centralized authority, to say what news any station must carry.

MR. COYNE: You have to agree with what I suggested, that in your view if this situation arose, if the CBC wants its news carried in the Hamilton area and disseminated in that area, and it can't come to satisfactory arrangements with existing stations there, then it should set up a station of its own?

MR. BALFOUR: That would seem to be the alternative, except the alternative of buying time.

MR. COYNE: Oh, yes, that would be another alternative.

MR. BALFOUR: I guess that first.

THE CHAIRMAN: Apart from just the news, and recognizing, Mr. Balfour, that you are not a direct operator, and therefore I shall try not to make this too technical, take the general question of programming in television, and particularly in this area at the moment where there is a pretty limited number of channels -- we may get some more on ultra high frequency -- is it your contention that there should be no control of programming at all on this limited number of available channels operated in private hands?

MR. BALFOUR: Within the control of the laws of the land, as we have stated.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course, laws can be passed.

MR. BALFOUR: No; the laws at present, under which we operate now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Suppose some person -- not you, but somebody else -- wanted to take up one of these few channels for the purpose of putting out nothing but advertising all day -- spot advertisements all day, and nothing else: do you think they should be allowed to do it?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes, sir, because I think the audience would turn them off and they would be cured.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, put it this way: do you think such a station, with a limited number of channels, should be without restriction allowed to carry nothing but American programmes all day and every day?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes, sir. I think they should be allowed freedom to carry their programmes. We mentioned in this brief that we thought the radio station and television station operators would perform better than I think many people think they would, given freedom to act, and I feel sure that a balance would result from this thing. A station would not last with just the endless American programmes, with no local aspect, no local news, no local sport. It would suffer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Supposing one of these stations did nothing -- carefully avoided the laws of obscenity, and so on -- but did nothing but sensational programmes, true story type of programmes, that appear in magazines?

MR. BALFOUR: Sir, I don't think the answer is censorship. I think the public itself would solve that problem. We, as newspapers, are subject to the pressures of our readers, and radio stations are subject to the pressures of their listeners, and I read the other day of some American network programme being taken off because the viewers, on the first wave of it, thought it was not suitable for the average family, so it never reached the West Coast at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, apart from regulation, is it your policy as a radio station operator to sell all your time -- all the time you can sell?

MR. BALFOUR: Up to a point.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, is there a point short of one hundred per cent?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes, there is a point because, as I said before, if you had a radio station which had nothing but advertising, nobody would look at it.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I am not talking about advertising matter. I am talking about sponsored programmes. Do you try to sell all your programmes on the radio?

MR. BALFOUR: I can't answer that question. I don't operate our radio stations, and I can't answer it.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the comparison with the newspaper, where undoubtedly there is a much longer period in which traditions of practice have been built up, one of which is the maintenance of a certain amount of unpaid editorial content in relation

to the volume of paid advertising ---

MR. BALFOUR: There are some variations there, sir, as you well know.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are some, I believe, but nevertheless there is a certain rule of thumb that is used in this field; but as far as I have been able to discover, this has not been applied in private commercial radio stations. If it is, I would like to hear about it.

MR. BALFOUR: I don't know, sir.

MR. COYNE: On page 3, in developing your point with regard to control of news and advertising, you say in about the middle of the page:

"Surely when Government becomes
the chief arbiter of dissemination of
published material . . ."

It has been represented to us that there is a distinction between the broadcasting system that is operated by a government department and a broadcasting system that is operated by a crown corporation responsible to Parliament as a whole. In other words, the CBC is not a government agency. It is an independent Crown Corporation which reports to Parliament as a whole. Do you feel there is a valid distinction there, and that a distinction can be drawn between a department of government and a crown corporation such as the CBC is today?

MR. BALFOUR: I think there is a degree of difference.

MR. COYNE: When you say, "Surely when

Government becomes the chief arbiter of dissemination . . .", is that, strictly speaking, correct, looking at the present situation? In other words, are the CBC and the Government of the day the same thing, or are they something different in your view?

MR. BALFOUR: In the final analysis I think they are.

MR. COYNE: They are the same thing?

THE CHAIRMAN: Different, or the same thing?

MR. BALFOUR: No, I think the CBC is, in the final analysis, an instrument of government.

THE CHAIRMAN: It may be an instrument of the State.

MR. BALFOUR: All right, sir, an instrument of the State.

THE CHAIRMAN: I thought that is what you were meaning; it is an instrument of the State rather than an instrument of Government, because there is another meaning to "Government".

MR. BALFOUR: Yes.

MR. COYNE: But your criticisms are directed as much towards an instrument of State such as the CBC is today as to an instrument of government?

MR. BALFOUR: As an instrument of the Cabinet, you mean?

MR. COYNE: Yes.

MR. BALFOUR: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Some other representations made to us have been along this line: they say, as you say, that control of an instrument of the State of this

medium can lead to serious dangers. Then, it has also been put to us that -- and you say, "Surely when Government becomes the chief arbiter of dissemination of published material under the claim it is in the public interest to so regulate it, we approach a monopoly that overshadows all others." Other people say, "Why should a handful of private individuals who happen to enjoy the privilege of using broadcasting channels -- and they are limited -- why should those private individuals be the chief arbiters of dissemination of published material?" Is it in the public interest that a small group of individuals or companies of that kind should be in this powerful position?

MR. BALFOUR: It seems to me there have been a number of representations to you, as you say, from groups which have indicated that the only monopoly which is a good one is the government monopoly, but all others are evil. I don't think that is so. I think that it is a fundamental principle that there should not be a government monopoly which will control the dissemination of news and information and restrict the free flow of conversation between man and man.

MR. COYNE: Why should it restrict that free flow any more than the control in a few individual hands could -- I am not saying "does" -- but "could" restrict the free flow to that flow which happens to be approved by the three or four individuals?

MR. BALFOUR: Because there are always checks and balances against the individuals; there are the checks and balances of competition.

MR. COYNE: Aren't there very effective checks and balances against the government about every four or five years?

MR. BALFOUR: That is a question, Mr. Coyne.

MR. COYNE: In any event, your point is that you do draw this distinction?

MR. BALFOUR: Between absolute government control and a restricted number of other people, I do. I think it is safer for the country to have it in the hands of a number of people than all in the hands of the government.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just on that, you say these other people are suggesting, in effect, that the only good monopoly is a government monopoly. Aren't you getting dangerously near the business of suggesting that the only good monopoly or near monopoly is a private monopoly?

MR. BALFOUR: I am not suggesting any of this is a private monopoly. I tried to show you in our own case that we are not a monopoly. We are subject to continuous pressures and competition of one kind or another both in the cities where we operate and from outside.

THE CHAIRMAN: But aren't the CBC-operated stations in the same kind of position too -- subject to competition from other people, according to our discussion earlier?

MR. BALFOUR: I don't follow what you are trying to get at there, except that they are subsidized. The rest of us are definitely operating for a living.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, my only point is that you are using the phrase "We approach a monopoly" -- that is as far as you are going, and I think the tenor of Mr. Coyne's question was to ask you whether the smaller group of people in charge of the limited number of channels is not also approaching a monopoly?

MR. BALFOUR: I think I am right in saying that there is a considerable number of channels available not at present in use.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is right.

MR. BALFOUR: And that this smaller group need not necessarily be so, if it were economically possible for those stations to exist.

MR. COYNE: But is that really relevant, because if they don't, in fact, exist, whether it is purely because of economic factors or not, surely that does not affect the situation, does it? The only reason that there are single newspapers in some cities, presumably, is because it is economically unsound for there to be more?

MR. BALFOUR: Isn't that a restraint itself against abuse? No newspaper management, unless it is most indiscreet, is going to abuse its position to the extent it places itself in an untenable, or at least places itself in a position where, not that it minds meeting competition, but

that it has abused its position in the city to such an extent that the public dislikes it so much that it would embrace a new man and the old one would die.

MR. COYNE: You mean that there is always potential competition?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: "Poised" competition?

MR. COYNE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why, if the Edmonton Journal, perhaps to its regret, finds itself in a monopoly position in the newspaper field, and it can be depended on by the force of public opinion to do a reasonably good public job notwithstanding that monopoly and position, why do you say that a government owned monopoly position, subject to all the many influences there are in our system, cannot be depended upon to do a reasonably good job in the public interest -- simply because it is a government monopoly? What is the difference between the two forces of public opinion working on these two types of semi-monopoly?

MR. BALFOUR: I believe the government in that case could become a tyranny, and the forces of public opinion would have no effect. I don't think the Edmonton Journal can become a tyranny.

MR. COYNE: I would like to go on, if I may, to your section on multiple ownership, and I have one or two questions. You quote the present regulations, Section 32(3)(d) of the Radio Regulations, and you say in your opinion this regulation is unsound and there is no valid reason for such

prohibition. I take it you feel it is unsound and it should be eliminated?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes, sir. We submit this for your examination. We think it should be eliminated. We know that a question of this kind is a very difficult one for us to advocate, but we place it before you for your consideration with our objections to the present regulation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne, are you on Section (d)?

MR. COYNE: Yes, at the bottom of page 4.

THE CHAIRMAN: I may have missed the question and the answer, but if that section is there it is a fact that apparently the permission of the Minister is frequently given to permit multiple ownership, isn't it?

MR. COYNE: I am not sure how long that particular regulation has been in the Regulations. Do you know that, Mr. Balfour?

MR. BALFOUR: That is quite recent, I believe.

MR. COYNE: Yes, that is my understanding.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the reason, then, because in your own case you have multiple ownership?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes, before there was television.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see.

MR. COYNE: Turning to the other point you raise in this section, you say, "Multiple ownership

should be subject only to such restrictions as the Combines Act specifies".

MR. BALFOUR: Yes.

MR. COYNE: I would not like to be sure of this, but my own understanding of that Act is that it applies to trades and industries producing and selling articles which enter into trade or commerce, and that the Combines Act at the present time does not apply to what are commonly called the service industries. Again it is my impression that newspapers would be regarded as a service industry rather than as a manufacturing or trading industry, and my question is, are you really recommending that the Combines Act, the present Act, should be amended to cover those businesses that are operating in the newspaper and radio and television field?

MR. BALFOUR: It is my understanding, and I am subject to correction by your eminent counsel, that the Combines Act does affect newspapers in so far as advertising is concerned -- circulation, I beg your pardon.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think as far as circulation is concerned: in other words, as to the price of your actual physical commodity as a piece of goods?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: But in radio and television you have no physical thing that you are selling, and I am inclined to agree with Mr. Coyne. You are saying, in effect, "Leave it to the Combines Act",

and at the moment the Combines Act can't touch you.

MR. COYNE: Presumably we cannot settle the question -- at least, I certainly would not venture to settle the question as to whether or not radio and television are now covered. Is it implicit in your suggestion that this be the method of control, and if that Act regulating and restricting monopolies does not now cover these particular industries that it should be amended to cover them?

MR. BALFOUR: We would certainly prefer it to this.

MR. COYNE: To the existing system?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Just one final question: Would it be fair to summarize your position in this way, Mr. Balfour, your submission; that you feel that subject to control of channels and other technical matters, where obviously an element of order must be maintained, and subject also to any laws of general application respecting sedition, libel and so on, apart from that, the private broadcasting stations should be permitted to operate as the newspapers operate without regulation or control of any kind as to their programme content?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes, sir.

MR. COYNE: And am I right in thinking that you couple with that the submission that the CBC in its own field of providing opportunities for Canadian talent in the field of music and drama and other similar fields should also operate at public cost

but without interfering with the private broadcasting field?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Is that a fair summary of your position?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And just, perhaps, to footnote that, I take it you are not objecting to the CEC as such; you are objecting to government control as such?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have only one other question: at the bottom of page 3 you say:

"In suggesting that private stations be free from coercion with respect to culture . . ." --

and I take it you mean there in respect of programmes --

" . . . we feel confident they can be counted on to make contributions in their own way."

It has been put to us, and I would like to get your view on it, that after twenty years of radio experience the contribution of the private stations to culture has been relatively slight. There is evidence on the other side too. This was the finding of the Massey Commission, I think. Have you anything to say on that as to why, if they can be counted on to make contributions in their own way to culture, this kind of charge can still be made after twenty odd years -- thirty years?

MR. BALFOUR: Well, sir, I think it is

very difficult for anyone operating a station or a newspaper to say, "I shall fill my station with culture", or "I shall do something", but I do feel the individual station owner and operator, by and large, is a decent citizen living in his community and with the interests of his community at heart, and that he will do within his power his best to give the best programme he can. There are exceptions.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we have had a lot of evidence to support your last statement, that the private station operators have made very material contributions to their communities in many ways, in the details of several representations we have had, but that is not what you are saying here. I could thoroughly understanding you saying, "We can't afford to", or "It is not our business to be involved in a matter of providing culture", but what you are saying here is that you feel confident the private stations can be counted on to make contributions to culture.

MR. BALFOUR: I think that is so, sir. I think as this industry has grown, and continues to grow, that it will, and as the demand for culture grows as this country expands and becomes ripe with years, that there will be an increasing amount. I don't believe that all the radio stations would just go to "rock and roll" all the time.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I have only one question: On page 6, your recommendation No. 3 -- and I bring it up to clear up a point on which

there may be a misconception -- it reads:

"The promotion of Canadian culture and the encouragement of native talent should continue to be furthered by the CBC . . ."

I take it that would not be the exclusive right of CBC, and that the private stations would continue as they have in the past to encourage local talent and encourage national heritage and national unity, and in every way foster a national scene?

MR. BALFOUR: Yes, sir, but I think I can answer that by saying there are certain things which are beyond the purse of any individual operator, perhaps, but which are apparently within the purse of the national body.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes, but I think some people could read into this that that should be the job of the CBC, and the private stations should not interfere in that way; but I don't imagine for a minute that that is your meaning.

MR. BALFOUR: No, sir.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Because, of course, having no networks of private stations, you are largely in local community work, but that again does not necessarily mean that you would not get into the national scene where necessary?

MR. BALFOUR: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just one final question: Have you given any thought at all to the problem of French-language broadcasts, or does this come

within your experience at all?

MR. BALFOUR: I am afraid it does not, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was just the fact that that is also part of the overall problem, which I am sure you recognize.

MR. BALFOUR: Yes, sir; it does not fall within the plans of our present operation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. We kept you rather a long time, but you can take that as an indication of our interest in your brief.

MR. BALFOUR: Thank you, sir.

---A short recess.

(Page 2848 follows)

SUBMISSION OF
CANADIAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

Appearances:

Mr. Robert H. Blackburn

Dr. Freda F. Walden

Miss Katherine Ball

Mr. William L. Graff

Mrs. John W. Falkner

Mr. David Foley

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, will you come to order, please?

The next brief we are to hear is that of the Canadian Library Association.

Dr. Walson, Hamilton -- I think you have a number of associates with you? Will you all come forward and take seats here?

MR. BLACKBURN: Mr. Chairman, my name is Blackburn. I will be presenting the brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Blackburn, we will mark your brief as Exhibit 119

EXHIBIT NO. 119: Brief of the Canadian Library Association.

MR. BLACKBURN: Do you wish me to read it, or, in view of the time, do you wish to skip that part?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it would be useful if you either read or highlighted the brief -- gave us the main points in it. You can do it that way,

or, if it is easier to read it, read it.

MR. BLACKBURN: "The presentation of this brief by the Canadian Library Association is prompted by interest in Canadian radio and television broadcasting from several different points of view.

1. "First, the more than seventeen hundred personal members -- librarians, library trustees, and other library supporters from every province --are interested personally and individually."

I will skip the rest of that paragraph.

"2. We are also interested in broadcasting as a stimulus to reading."

And I have referred there to some of the book programmes -- reviewing programmes, such as Critically Speaking, and so on, which stimulate reading.

"3. We suggest, however, that on the other hand an undiluted diet of western movies, murder mysteries, spy dramas, give-away programmes, and sentimental comedies may have a devitalizing effect on the mind; certainly they do not inspire any constructive reading.

4. Broadcasting is important to us also in our own efforts to promote library use. Some public libraries are given free broadcasting time for their story hours, book talks, and other library centred programmes; many private local stations are generous in this regard.

Our Association has received radio and television publicity, locally and on a national scale, for one of its nationwide projects, Young Canada's Book Week. Naturally we should like this sort of cooperation with our own projects to continue and increase.

5. We think that television provides an excellent but so far untried chance for the revival of an age-old art which in recent times has been in danger of becoming lost -- the art of story telling. Good story telling, of course, incidentally stimulates good reading."

I have discovered a discrepancy at this point. I heard only yesterday that there is in Kingston a story telling programme which has been successfully produced on TV. I think that doesn't modify our point, it strengthens it.

"6. We are interested, too, in the encouragement and development of Canadian writers, composers, and other artists; and we are grateful to our present broadcasting system for what it does in this field. Moreover, we are convinced that no such effective encouragement of Canadian talent could exist if broadcasting were not publicly supported.

7. Our principal interest, however, springs from the central purpose of our work. Our member libraries are of many sizes and many kinds serving various constituencies -- public and institutional and private -- but

their existence and their operation are motivated by various combinations of three objectives; information, education, and recreation. They operate principally in the realm of the printed word; and while print, as a medium of communication, has the advantages of being permanent and easily referred to, it is less a 'mass medium' than either radio or television. In radio and television we recognize powerful potential allies in the task of providing the people of Canada with information, education, and recreation -- and we are anxious for them to be used accordingly.

8. We are therefore emphatically in favour of the present system of broadcasting in Canada. We believe that broadcasting, which is a natural monopoly, must be regulated and conducted in the public interest; we agree, that is, with the general conclusions of the Aird Commission and of the various Parliamentary committees on broadcasting. To these, and to the excellent conclusions and recommendations of the Massey Commission, we would add the observations which follow.

9. Through our experience of many and various efforts to extend library service to sparsely populated sections of the country, we are not only acquainted with the difficulty of serving such areas, but are also acutely aware of the special need for libraries

and broadcasting services in such areas (that is, in the greater part of Canada). As one of our own members writes of her own town: 'Certainly life in a place like ---- would be quite unbearable without the CBC. It supplies music, talks, and other entertainment and enlightenment which is available from no other source to the thousands of Canadians all over Canada who live outside the big cities. Also, it is a link between people all across the country, letting us know what goes on, what is thought about in different parts of the country, and providing to some extent a common experience for all of us that can give us a feeling of oneness, as Canadians, and dissipate the isolation of our vast distances. I think the private stations have a local function to perform, which they can do, perhaps better than the CBC. The CBC's function is different, and nationwide. We need both.'

10. For reasons that are explained in Chapter XVIII of the Massey Report, it seems obvious to us that the nationwide provision of an informative and stimulating variety of programmes implies both public support and public regulation of broadcasting.

11. The problem of forming a nation in the northern part of North America has been largely a problem of establishing communications. It

has been a task beyond the powers of private enterprise alone. First canals and then railways had to be subsidized by the government, or the scattered settlements could never have been welded into the nation. The same conditions apply to the new means of communication by radio and television. Services are needed which cannot be provided commercially but which are necessary in the national sense. Because the United States is almost unique among the nations in having been able to maintain broadcasting without government assistance, Canadians should not be misled into thinking that a similar system would suit their very different conditions. There has developed in this country a compromise between British and American methods which is admired by many other countries. Indeed, the British are now copying it to some extent in regard to television. Commercial interests provide local stations here (an important service absent from the British system) and the CBC provides network programmes of high calibre and national importance. Many groups in the United States are now seeking ways to develop non-commercial TV in an effort to give people the kind of programming which has been developed with such conspicuous success in this country by the CBC. Various American universities, charitable foundations,

and committees of citizens are spending millions of dollars on stations and programmes, but the efforts of voluntary bodies cannot begin to match the coverage and service Canada has in its national system.

12. Because children are attracted almost irresistibly to television and are strongly influenced by what they see, we believe it is especially important that the highest possible standards be maintained in children's programmes.

13. The high cost of television, the high potential of advertising income from it, and its importance as a broadcasting medium, make the matter of public support extremely important. There have been good programmes and poor ones, both sponsored and unsponsored, but at present the viewer is left with the impression that planning of programmes for the national service is not sufficiently independent of pressures exerted by advertisers. If our objectives are to be met, it is essential that the national broadcasting service have regular and sufficient financial support to make the content and general level of its programmes immune to commercial pressures. At the same time, it should still be free to make use of imported or sponsored programmes which are of national interest.

14. Since nationwide coverage depends on the

combination of public and privately owned facilities, we think that it is essential that the control of channels, networks, reserved time, and other operating arrangements be in the hands of the CBC, and we are not afraid of the control being misused as long as the CBC is responsible to Parliament. We take it for granted that the CBC Board of Governors should be a strong and representative body.

15. We suggest that new arrangements are needed to enforce regulations regarding advertising practices, limitation on the use of records and films, and similar matters of programme content. At present, enforcement of these regulations is one of the responsibilities of the CBC Station Relations division. This combination of apparently contradictory functions seems undesirable. There is the possibility that 'station relations' could be influenced by the threat of a regulation being invoked; but the results suggest rather that regulations tend to be overlooked for the sake of good 'station relations'. We suggest that this regulating function be divorced from the operational departments, made responsible directly to the governing board, and equipped to do adequate checking of the programmes, both of private stations and of the CBC.

16. One truth must be recognized: culture cannot be made to pay. Libraries, museums,

symphony orchestras, opera, ballet, universities and schools for all the people, cannot be provided on a profit basis. There is no reason why broadcasting should be expected to support itself either, unless Canadians are content to have it used primarily to provide light entertainment as an adjunct to salesmanship.

17. CBC programmes could be improved -- we hope they will be -- but we take pride in the high degree of success they have already attained in providing information, good entertainment, great drama and music, unbiased news, and serious discussion of public issues. We believe that they have already made an enormous contribution to the development of national spirit in this country.

"We believe it is imperative that a solution be found for the financial problems of the CBC, to assure the continuation and improvement of the present system of broadcasting in this country."

To the list of Associations which have endorsed this brief I would like to add the London Public Library Association, which sent an endorsement last week.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Blackburn. Are there any of your associates who wish to add to the brief at this stage?

Yes, Mr. de Grandpre.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You state that your Association comprises approximately seventeen hundred members?

MR. BLACKBURN: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And you list at the end of your brief the various Associations which have endorsed the brief. Could you tell us how this brief was prepared and how it came to be drafted in its final form?

MR. BLACKBURN: Yes. There have been times we could have had the brief prepared and passed by a general meeting of the Association. However, time was too short for that.

The Executive of the Association, when the Commission was announced, discussed the possibility of making representations and decided in favour of so doing, appointed Mrs. Waldon and me as a committee with power to provide a brief. We drew up a first draft which was circulated to the Council of our Association, and by the constitution our Council and Executive was empowered to act in the absence of an annual meeting; and, also, it is the body responsible for the policy of the Association. Members of the Council, including members of the incoming Council for next year, making altogether a body of 34 people, received copies of the first draft, sent in their suggestions, and a second draft was drawn up. The first draft had been sent also -- a number of copies -- to the chairmen or presidents of affiliated library associations and a request was sent at the same time for the use of their names in

connection with this brief. We also received suggestions from some of these associations. We compiled these in the second brief which again was circulated to Council members and to affiliates. I might say that the suggestions, while they were practical, dealt mainly with wording and sentence structure and not with policy. There was no dissent from the tenor of this brief at any point, or in any individual letters which I received.

Meanwhile, the membership at large had been informed that the brief was being prepared, and I also received letters from our individual members; and, as a matter of fact, this letter which is quoted to you came in from an individual member who is not a member of the Council.

The Council, however, passed this brief before it was sent on to the Commission.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was this approval of your affiliations -- was that based on the final draft?

MR. BLACKBURN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: So that after you had sent it in to the Commission you apparently had it endorsed by certain of your affiliated associations, did you?

MR. BLACKBURN: After it was finally drafted and before it went in. The final draft that went to the Commission had some commas moved, but there was nothing changed.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You state in your paragraph No. 2, on the first page of your brief, that the

book reviews bring an immediate demand in your libraries for the original books. That is an interesting statement, because yesterday we were told that broadcasting in general had the tendency of creating passivity, and apparently this is quite a different result.

MR. BLACKBURN: If I might, I would ask Dr. Waldon to speak to that.

DR. WALDON: On that it works both ways. Sometimes the children may not want to read the book because they have seen it on television, but I think, more often, they do come in. It works that way with comics. Sometimes the child won't want to read the book because it has read the comic, and sometimes it will read the book because it has read the comic. It depends on the presentation.

If you start a story and say, "Go to the public library to get the rest of it", they will flock to it.

MR. BLACKBURN: In that regard, I think there is an arrangement, so far as "Cuckoo Clock House" books are concerned, whereby the various public libraries have sufficient copies bought to meet the anticipated demand.

MR. de GRANDPRE: This particular trend that you have just mentioned -- has it been more noticeable for the teenagers or is it more noticeable for the youngsters, or is it evenly balanced between the children of all ages?

DR. WALDON: I would think that, perhaps,

it affects the children more. After Hidden Pages was started we found that, while the demand for the Cuckoo Clock House books continued, there was more effect from Hidden Pages.

We haven't had -- I don't think -- a TV teenage book review. I think that the children's books would, generally, be more effective, perhaps, than with teenage book reviews; but I wouldn't want to be too positive about that.

MR. GRAFF: So far as Teenage Book Parade is concerned, which is a TV broadcast, while it was supposed to be for teenagers, in our library in Peterborough -- where I was until recently -- we had a very notable response from other than teenagers -- in other words, adults who were interested in the books that we reviewed.

Mr. Clay prepared the script and I got it programmed, and in view of that the people know what book is going to be reviewed and we have to make sure we have adequate copies to meet the demand. It is an interesting feature.

General broadcasting in radio and television may occupy some people's time which they might use for reading, but radio and television can stimulate an interest in books, too. There are two different aspects.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You indicate that you would like these book reviews on television -- they have been broadcast on radio up to now -- that you would like these book reviews on television. Do

you really feel that television is a proper medium for book reviews, and if so in what respect?

DR. WALDON: I believe that there is one programme -- and it is the only book-reviewing programme I know about, and it is the one that the London Public Library has put out in conjunction with the local station there, which has created a tremendous demand for the books.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that television or radio?

DR. WALDON: Television.

If I might raise a point there, as stated in the brief we think it would be an encouragement to local stations to put on good programmes like that if they could be picked up by the CBC and made available to other regions. The cost of that is infinitesimal compared to most programmes -- that is, the staff time that is involved in it. And the publishers are supporting it by sending in copies of the books.

If we wanted to start such a thing -- the Hamilton Public Library, that is -- the publishers mightn't be so ready to send us any copies for display and for review; so that it really might not be very practical for a number of individual different libraries and stations to do it. But the programme, I think, with a very little bit of -- with, perhaps, more dressing up and showmanship -- would be good enough to be used elsewhere; and I have been wondering if it wouldn't be an encouragement to private stations if the CBC could do that kind of thing -- pick up good local programmes and distribute them

to other regions.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we were told at one place that this has happened -- not particularly this programme, because apparently it hasn't been done -- but I think we were told there was a programme on London television -- is that it -- that had been picked up and put on the CBC network.

MR. de GRANDPRE: There were some programmes which were finally picked up by the network, but I can't remember where they originated.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: In televising these book reviews do they try to dramatize the story, or is it merely ---

DR. WALDON: There is a good presentation, but it is fairly simple. They show illustrations, I think, so that it isn't one person speaking. They would show the speakers first for a little while and then show the format of the book and anything interesting about the book.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But they don't try to dramatize it orally?

DR. WALDON: No.

MISS BALL: In Hidden Pages they did, which was a children's TV programme. They dramatized and read the story at the same time.

MR. de GRANDPRE: It is in that sense you feel that TV could play an important part?

Then, in the next paragraph you say:

"We suggest, however, that on the other hand an undiluted diet of western

movies, murder mysteries, spy
dramas, give-away programmes, and
sentimental comedies may have a de-
vitalizing effect on the mind;
certainly, they do not inspire any
constructive reading."

(Page 2864 follows)

You realize, of course, that the CBC, as any other station, has to give a balanced diet of programmes and if you give too serious programmes all the time you are bound to lose a substantial portion of the possible business. Do I understand from this paragraph that you are against or you simply suggest that they be reduced to a restricted minimum?

MR. BLACKBURN: We are certainly against an undiluted diet as such, and that is a problem that comes up in public libraries, public money is being spent on books, shall we get light fiction, popular novels, popular books of information or shall we concentrate on classics, and libraries have never come to a final conclusion about this. However, in general I think it is fair to say that we have to strike a balance, and it is never all one way or the other and the balance has swung more and more, I think, towards serious reading. Perhaps public libraries have something to give us about this.

DR. WALDON: As a matter of fact, we have reason to be grateful to pocket books and television and radio for relieving us of the demand for light reading, people get their dreams, their escape entertainment, in other forms. But, I might say, even when we do have mysteries and some lighter reading we do try to be discriminating and get the best of their kind. I do think that both radio and TV, if you are going to do westerns and mysteries and so on, should try to be discriminating and produce good programmes of their kind. What we were

objecting to is the continuous running of this kind of thing without any other programmes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you feel that the broadcasters up to now have hit a proper medium, or is this to be construed as a complaint or simply as a warning?

MR. BLACKBURN: I think it is a warning, as far as I am concerned; would you be satisfied with that?

DR. WALDON: I am really thinking of the TV Guide, when you run down the programmes and see evening after evening nothing that you would want to watch, that I would want to watch. I don't know whether there are any Canadian stations that would be giving the views -- I do not know the programmes well enough.

MR. de GRANDPRE: So it is more in the nature of a warning than in the nature of a complaint?

DR. WALDON: Yes, we do not want to see it happen.

MR. BLACKBURN: We got to one point in the preparation of the brief, the final stage was notification of all Toronto members of the Association when the date for this hearing was set, and I am pleased to see a great many members in our audience.

THE CHAIRMAN: So are we.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You make the very broad statement on the top of page 2:

"Moreover, we are convinced that no such effective encouragement of Canadian talent could exist if broadcasting were not publicly supported."

Do you feel that if the broadcasting field had been left to the private broadcasters you would not have reached a similar result either by self regulating or by regulating?

MR. BLACKBURN: I will take responsibility for having written that paragraph, sir. What I had in mind was a public meeting I attended in Toronto, at which there were speakers from the CBC and from CARTB from the artists' association, and this point was made, and Mr. Job, the late Mr. Fenwick Job, who at that time was representing CARTB, said that while they were in the medium -- I think that was the word he used -- to make money, that their first responsibility was, first of all, to pay dividends to the shareholders and they quite incidentally do other things, but that was their primary purpose and they simply could not as individual stations afford to raise fees and so on, which would help to develop Canadian talent. I think it was one of his points that they might discover local talent through a more or less amateur basis but they could not attempt to develop Canadian talent.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But is there not an interplay between results or dividends and quality of programming or the taste of the public?

MR. BLACKBURN: I am sure there is, but I think there could not have been such an effective encouragement of Canadian talent as there has been. It is a matter of degree, I think.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But if you push this a

little further and if you try to hang the grapes a little too high you might not reach the public you want to reach and that is one of the complaints we have heard on our trips, that some of the programmes were of such a high brow type that the listeners would not listen to them and they would simply tune in on another station and there they would get the type of programmes they were prepared to listen to. So, do you achieve the result you want to achieve by making these programmes too intellectual?

MR. BLACKBURN: I do not quite see the relevance of that in connection with the encouragement of Canadian talent. Are you suggesting that Canadian talent has developed to such a peak that nobody can appreciate it?

THE CHAIRMAN: That has not been suggested yet.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I think we were driven from the original question when we reached the suggestion of their making money and not being interested in producing what is commonly called cultural programmes or intellectual programmes or good musical programmes, and by the same token expecting the Canadian talent to produce such a programme.

MR. BLACKBURN: I think the point Mr. Job made and the one we are making here is, a live orchestra costs more than a recording, and if the object is to broadcast a Brahms's Sonata the private station will do it with the record.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just on this point, your

group has wide contact with the public and irrespective of who produces it we have to say something apparently from our Terms of Reference on the question of programme content. Now, we have had a conflict of evidence as between two broad classifications, of the cultural programme on the one hand and the programme of what is called mainly pure entertainment on the other. Have you had contact with the public sufficiently to indicate to us whether or not the so-called cultural types of programme are in fact listened to and watched? Does that fall within your experience, because we have had it charged that people just turn it off and won't look at it, they will not listen to it.

MR. BLACKBURN: When we were drawing up this brief some of the letters that came in referred to such things as CBC Wednesday Night as being very desirable. Is that the sort of programme that has been objected to by other groups?

THE CHAIRMAN: We have not particularized that way, but it is a good illustration of the more cultural type of programme, I think.

MR. BLACKBURN: I think, however, there is a danger in speaking of culture and entertainment as though they were two different things, and that is a problem that we have in our libraries, and we find that one book may be light entertainment for one person and the same book will be a real challenge to another person. It depends on the point of view of the receiver as well as the programme itself.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that similar point has been made; I was trying to put it into part of the evidence to you to hear what you would say about it. In your contacts with the public is there any indication at all of the actual conflict of listening and viewing the so-called cultural programmes?

MR. BLACKBURN: Not the public I am in contact with in the University of Toronto.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the public libraries what is the answer?

DR. WALDON: Well, I would think that perhaps our public would tend to be the public for the private radio and TV programmes, and the fact that they do ask for books that are mentioned ---

MR. GRAFF: I would like to comment on that. In our public libraries we get all classes of people and as far as culture is concerned, it is not all in one group. In our libraries we have discussions and the people who attend may be truck drivers or the late Mayor Rush was a member of that in London, and there is a difference in taste in entertainment and cultural activities between what people want in their books and ordinary entertainment, their radio and television. When Mr. Priestley was in the city and the discussion went on at the Crest Theatre, I think a point was made by Mr. Robertson Davies that Joe Doakes is not a moron, even though in the field of mass communication it is given that way. Definitely public taste is improving all the time.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Could I ask just one question. You say:

"Particularly we would like to have a book reviewing programme on TV."

Of course, speaking as librarians in the field of the type of programme you think it stimulates reading and increases the need of your service, but if you look at it from the publishers' viewpoint, do you think you may get such programmes sponsored, because, after all, it develops not only reading but possibly sales. The reason I ask this question, in the same paragraph you refer to a Teenage Book Parade and the CARTB as the association of broadcasters who distribute it, but it itself does not prepare the programme, but do I take it that some private stations have been carrying such book reviews free of charge, unsponsored? Is there a possibility of getting revenue out of that; is there a possibility of making it attractive to the listener or viewer and to those who sponsor it? Is that a possibility?

DR. WALDON: It is a possibility, but you would not want a book programme sponsored by one publisher, it would have to be a publishing association because you might want to criticize books adversely.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Along this line of sponsoring children's programmes, do you have any views on whether children's programmes should be or should not be sponsored because of the influence of the

advertising material on the children's minds?

MR. GRAFF: I have had an experience in this where a children's book review programme or story telling programme was sponsored by a children's shoe store and later on by a dairy, but eventually the station themselves decided it would be better if the public library actually had that particular activity and function as a public service. Our private radio stations in this country have given us, I would say, almost unlimited time for using the means of radio broadcasting in trying to help promote library activities, but there is one difficulty with regard to that, we have to take the time when it is available, naturally, because it is free, but I think credit should be given to the private radio stations for the special public service they have done in this teenage book period. The teenage book period is prepared and there are 45 radio stations in Canada participating, and usually the librarian in this particular community will take the script and read it, the scripts are very well prepared and they do save the librarian's time. We have many other activities and it is a tremendous contribution. Two approaches to the matter of book reviewing, both from the children's point of view and the adult, but particularly from the adult, a book review by one person in front of a camera can be dull, and, as a matter of fact, in the United States most of the commercial stations when it was suggested were against it. However, by

putting it on through panels, leaders or experts discussing a book in a certain field or introducing them, is the approach and working in radio stations our librarians are helping considerably; and in the programmes going out from Toronto probably they receive a tremendous amount of aid and support from the Toronto Public Library for their sets, background material, and perhaps it is their idea in the first place. The same thing is true in the small private stations where programme directors -- and I am particularly speaking of Peterborough -- are in constant contact with the public library for ideas from magazines and periodicals and books, and radio stations and TV stations perform a vital service to the public in entertainment and education.

Education does not necessarily have to be dull; it is a matter of showmanship in education, that is the crux of the matter.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But you have no particular experience in the question of the sponsoring of children's programmes as such, whether they are good, bad or indifferent?

MR. GRAFF: Well, a number of our libraries have story hours unsponsored.

THE CHAIRMAN: No experience with sponsoring as to whether the sponsoring is a bad thing or not?

MR. GRAFF: Well, in this particular case it was commercially sponsored, and the radio station decided -- the sponsor was changing, and they did

not want an unacceptable sponsor and they felt it was a genuine function for the library.

DR. WALDON: I would prefer to not have them sponsored.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: On the question of the teenage programme, is that a public service?

MR. GRAFF: As a public service of the CARTB, it can be sponsored actually by the station.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: If it finds a sponsor?

MR. GRAFF: Yes, in other words it is a commercial programme for the public libraries, we do not pay for it.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: It is a public service rendered by the private stations?

MR. GRAFF: That is correct.

DR. WALDON: We do not quarrel with the value of the private stations when we say that the so-called "cultural" programmes need to be subsidized; we also recognize that your local service needs to be subsidized. If the local stations were all CBC or government supported the cost would be tremendous, I do not think we can afford it. I think I was responsible for the putting in something about private stations because the last time I was in England I listened to the radio as much as I could and I felt it was awfully remote and the absence of local stations was a serious loss, and yet I could not see any way of financing local stations except commercially, and I do think they serve a very

good purpose, and they have been very generous to the libraries as far as I know them, and certainly the Hamilton ones have been extremely good to the library and to many other public causes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You conclude your brief by touching the question of the financial problems of the CBC but you do not go very fully into this question; have you given any thought as to the means of financing the Corporation, or was this subject not discussed?

MR. BLACKBURN: It was discussed by Miss Waldon and myself when we were trying to compile the brief, but we felt we did not have anything constructive to offer in that field, we do not know anything about costs except what we can read in the CBC annual reports, nor do we have any real suggestions to make about the way in which the money should be raised. It seems that the cost is related directly to the area covered, and we assume that there will be as wide coverage as possible. I do not think we have specified, but that includes English and French coverage as wide as possible. What these costs would be we have no way of telling.

MR. de GRANDPRE: In general terms as to the manner of raising funds, whether it should be by licence fee or excise tax or by grant, have you given any thought to the general principles of the financing?

MR. BLACKBURN: Not in the Council, and, therefore, I cannot speak for the Association. My own view, if this is worth anything to you, is that

the licensing as we knew it before was inefficient and a sort of nuisance licence that many people were able to avoid, and many people who were not able to avoid it still wished it were not there. It does seem that a grant out of tax money would be a more efficient way of doing it. I think we would say it should be given regularly so that from the standpoint of the national system it could have an assured income some way related to the service to be rendered.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you make that point in the final paragraph of your brief when you say:

" . . .to assure the continuation and improvement of the present system of broadcasting in this country."

MR. BLACKBURN: Yes.

DR. WALDON: I think we would like to see some sort of standard set, so much per capita or so much per set in use, or some objective measurement so the CBC could estimate what their revenue is going to be and make their plans accordingly.

THE CHAIRMAN: And there are others?

DR. WALDON: Yes, but with some sort of an objective measurement so they can estimate it and say, "Well, give us so much".

THE CHAIRMAN: Your point is, you feel for good management and proper development of the function which you want to see done, you feel finances have to be put on a sound basis?

DR. WALDON: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is all, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to thank you all very much and also your supporters in the background. I am sorry we have not had as much time with you as we wanted to. Thank you.

(Page 2877 follows)

SUBMISSION OF
THE ROYAL CONSERVATORY OF MUSIC OF TORONTO

Appearances:

Dr. B. Neel

Dr. Walter

- - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: We have one more brief, and that is the brief of the Royal Conservatory of Music. Dr. Mazzelene, and Dr. Walter and Dr. Neel.

DR. NEEL: Mr. Chairman, Dr. Mazzelene could not come, and Dr. Walter has joined me.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will mark your brief as Exhibit No. 120.

EXHIBIT NO. 120: Brief of The Royal Conservatory of Music of Toronto

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Walter, will you proceed to either outline or read your brief, as you choose?

DR. WALTER: Mr. Chairman, actually the brief was prepared by Dean Neel.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, I made a wrong assumption.

DR. NEEL: Maybe I will run quickly through it first. This deals chiefly with the connection, or rather the interrelation between the Royal Conservatory and the musical profession at large, which again interrelates with the CBC, because naturally the CBC depend to a great extent on musicians for their programmes.

"As the largest musical teaching

institution in Canada, and, incidentally, probably in the world, the Royal Conservatory of Music of Toronto is concerned with the training of thousands of students annually. Last year there were approximately 7,000 registered students at the Conservatory. As the training ground for the majority of Canada's finest musicians, the Royal Conservatory of Music is naturally extremely concerned with the future of music as regards broadcasting. Music forms a large part of broadcasting performance, both on sound and television; in fact, it is probably true to say that it is the main basic ingredient of broadcasting the world over. With the advent of television, a new field of musical performance was opened up, and producers are now experimenting in order to find out how music will best fit into the new medium. We cannot stress too strongly the importance of keeping, and even of elaborating, the present musical policy of the Canadian Broadcasting Commission as regards good music. Broadcasting, both on radio and television, constitutes the main source of income for hundreds of our trained students and, therefore, we consider it of the utmost importance that fine music continue to form a large proportion of CBC programmes. We would suggest that more revenue be found to increase the broadcasting of good music on

television and on sound.

(1) The Importance of Radio: Sound broadcasting was, and is, the perfect medium for the dissemination of fine music, as the eye and the concentration of the listener are undisturbed by visual stimulation. It is felt that sound broadcasting will continue to be of the utmost value to musical performance and will never lose its importance, even though the new medium of television may offer different channels whereby fine music can be heard by the masses.

(2) Canadian Music: The broadcasting of compositions by native Canadian composers has been the chief source of inspiration for these creative artists, and the enlightened policy of the Corporation in presenting the works of these composers has afforded a wonderful stimulus to serious creative art in Canada because of the fact that a composer knows his work has a good chance of being performed when completed.

(3) Alternative Radio Programmes: We would like to see the CBC provide an alternative radio programme as on the English BBC; a programme which might be looked upon as something in the nature of the Third Programme in England, or the Wednesday Night programme in Canada. A network carrying such programmes could devote much time to the broadcasting of

fine music. There is no doubt that public interest in music of first rate quality is increasing year by year. The enormous increase in the sale of long-playing records of the highest quality music is evidence of this fact. In the United Kingdom it was found that the minority which appreciated the better things in art was far larger than any one ever suspected, and the establishment of the Third Programme was an event of the first magnitude in the artistic life of the country.

"We venture to suggest that the same thing could easily happen in Canada, were the CBC to take a firm lead and devote one network exclusively to the broadcast of the very best in art. This, we hope, could eventually occur on television, as well as on sound, but, we feel that at this moment when sponsored time is being transferred from sound to television, the CBC should step in to fill this vacuum with the very best in art. The CBC is the only means whereby good music is likely to be broadcast in quantity, because commercial broadcasting does not regard the highest class music as of sponsorship value. We venture to suggest that this viewpoint is a misguided one, but it is prevalent enough to constitute an evil which must be carefully watched.

(4) Democracy and Good Taste: The Royal Conservatory would suggest that in considering

the reaction of the public, quality should be obtained by a levelling up, rather than a levelling down. In a recent book called 'The Treason of the People', Mr. Ferdinand Lundberg states that '...it is a complete vulgarization of the democratic idea to suppose that the true democrat shows his democratic spirit when he conforms to low denominators of taste and behaviour. Rather, it is the democratic duty of the citizenry to comport itself in accord with maximum standards of taste, behaviour and discrimination. To do less is to be faithless to the democratic idea, to be undemocratic'.

(5) School Programmes: The Directorate of the Royal Conservatory greatly desires to see educational programmes encouraged, especially on television. The CBC has a very good educational programme on sound radio to schools, but the Directorate would like to see more educational programmes of a broader nature, which might appeal to adults as well as children, on both sound and television, especially television.

(6) Private Stations and the C.B.C.: As regards the future role of the private stations, it would seem that if the CBC is to specialize in the more artistic type of programming, the lighter and more popular elements of entertainment should eventually be left to the private

stations. In effect, this obtains at the present time, but we would like to see it still more emphasized in the future. If the Royal Conservatory is to continue turning out large numbers of serious professional musicians each year, the provision of employment for these artists is of the greatest importance for the nation, and it is well known that the finest in art can never pay for itself, but must always have either private or public backing. Today, private support is insufficient to sustain the arts in any country, so that other means have to be found. In many countries this means is being provided through the medium of a broadcasting system which acts as a kind of official sponsor of the best in art.

"The contrast between the number of live performances on the CBC and the private stations is very marked. The private stations hardly ever engage Canadian artists, but rely almost entirely on recordings. It is felt that the CBC should exercise greater control over this matter and insist on a definite quota of live talent being used on private stations.

(7) The C.B.C. and the Canada Council: With the formation of a Canada Council imminent, we suggest the closest liaison possible with the CBC when the policy of the Council is being outlined, in order that nourishment of

artistic enterprise can be brought to its fullest fruition.

(8) Collaboration with Musical Organizations:

Institutions such as the CBC Symphony Orchestra in Toronto and other orchestras in Canada maintained or assisted by the Corporation are vital and essential to the future of music in this country. We would like to see an expansion of this orchestral programme continuing steadily throughout the coming years, and it is an enormous advantage to Canada to possess a broadcasting system whereby this can be achieved. One has only to look across the border to the United States to realize the good fortune of Canada in this matter. We see there instances of sponsorship suddenly ceasing and leaving artistic enterprises stranded without any means of continuing broadcasting. The system is completely uncertain and unreliable. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, on the other hand, offers a steady and reliable medium through which musical organizations can be heard by the public at large.

(9) Opera: The Royal Conservatory of Music very much approves of the operatic policies of the CBC and would like even more opera on both television and sound. Television can be an excellent medium for the broadcasting of opera, provided the necessary adaptations are made with skill under the guidance of trained

musicians.

"The Royal Conservatory regrets that the broadcasting of opera on sound radio has been curtailed in Toronto. We would like to point out that the Conservatory possesses at present the largest Opera School in Canada and that, therefore, there is bound to be a large concentration of operatic talent in Toronto. It must be strongly emphasized that the entire chorus and many of the principal roles in these broadcast operas were drawn from students and graduates of the Royal Conservatory, and during the last year much genuine hardship has been suffered in Toronto owing to this change of policy. Many of the students relied on the fees they received from these operatic performances to help pay for their studies and to carry them through that difficult period when they must establish themselves in the profession or abandon music altogether. A reversion of more performances of opera in Toronto is regarded as an urgent matter by the Directorate.

"While agreeing with the principle of diffusing broadcast performances through the Dominion as much as possible, it is felt that the case of opera should be dealt with as a more special item, owing to this geographical fact. In the course of time other opera schools of similar size and importance may be established in Canada, but, at the present

moment, Toronto would seem to be the operative centre, and, it is felt, should be regarded as such by the CBC.

(10) C.B.C. Opera Committee: In the past, there was an institution known as the Opera Committee which consisted of members of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, with representatives from the Royal Conservatory. This Committee was able to work out an operative policy to the benefit of all concerned, and the Royal Conservatory deplores the cessation of its activities during the last few years.

(11) C.B.C. and The Opera Festival Association of Toronto: The Royal Conservatory feels that the Opera Festival Association of Toronto, being as it is by far the most important opera producing body in Canada, should be used by the CBC for television and sound performances. Its annual performances of opera could be transferred to sound or television at a considerable saving of rehearsals, and therefore, expense. Such broadcasts would publicize the excellent pioneer work which it is doing and hasten the establishment of a Canadian national opera company. They would help to retain Canadian talent in Canada and automatically increase the sources of talent for CBC productions in general. The Opera Festival Association of Toronto should have equal support to such organizations as the Toronto Symphony

Orchestra, The Mendelssohn Choir, or the Promenade Concerts.

(12) Imported Programmes: Programmes which are taken from the United States should, we feel, be of the highest possible quality -- otherwise, there is little point in taking such programmes. Programmes such as the New York Philharmonic Orchestra on Sundays and the Metropolitan Opera on Saturdays are justified in every possible way, since such performances cannot be obtained from Canadian sources. But, where Canadian talent of comparable or superior quality is available, there should be no question of an American programme being taken.

(13) The C.B.C. and The Royal Conservatory of Music: Finally, we would like to state that it is our desire to work in far greater collaboration with the CBC than we do at present, and we feel it would be to the utmost benefit to the musical profession in Canada if there could be more liaison between the Royal Conservatory and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. The Conservatory is by far the largest musical teaching institution in the Dominion and it follows that it must, therefore, provide the greatest number of performing artists used by the CBC in their work; yet, at present, there is but the minimum of collaboration between these two great institutions.

"The Directors hope for more collaboration in the future."

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Neel. Mr. de Grandpre?

MR. de GRANDPRE: I have only very few questions. This is a brief which has been partially touched this morning because it deals with music. The importance of radio, which is dealt with at the bottom of page 1, indicates that sound broadcasting was and is the perfect medium for the dissemination of fine music. I take it from your remarks of your colleague this morning, that this is true in the purest form of music, but if you get down to opera and like forms of music, such as operattas, then television would appear to be an equally good medium?

DR. NEEL: I think we could look at it in that way, yes; I think so.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Then you suggest the creation of a Third Programme: how do you visualize this Third Programme or third network?

THE CHAIRMAN: Actually he is speaking of an alternative radio programme on the English BBC; we have two networks now.

DR. NEEL: Yes, I believe originally the idea of the Dominion network was that it could act as a kind of Third Programme. I mean, the equivalent of the English Third Programme. I believe that was the original intention, but through the years it does not seem to have worked out that way. I am new to the Canadian scene, and I don't know the history of it, but I am told that is so by people who seem to know the history of these matters.

Now, of course, there is no alternative at all, really. If there is such and such a thing on one network you may be pretty well certain there will be the same kind of thing on the other.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is alternative in that it is different from -- not in the sense that you are putting forward -- having a totally separate kind of programme.

DR. NEEL: That is right. It is a subtle distinction of alternativity.

THE CHAIRMAN: I know you are anxious to see Canadian music and Canadian musicians and artists used in radio and television, but suppose your suggestion of a special programme of high quality being introduced either in substitution for the present Dominion network or in addition to it were brought in, that would be a pretty expensive business to do it live throughout. Would you think it desirable to have such a programme even if, for perhaps some time to come, a good proportion of it or a very large proportion of it would have to be of a recorded musical form?

DR. NEEL: I think that would have to be in the first place, hoping that eventually it would grow into a fully live institution.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: In other words, you first taste through the cheaper method?

DR. NEEL: Yes. I would like to see something like WQXR station in New York as a start, with "live" interspersed until it is all live. That

is, I think, run by the New York Times, and it consists entirely of what we like to call good music, on records.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You say that the private stations hardly ever engage Canadian artists, but rely almost entirely on recordings, and you say it is felt that the CBC should exercise greater control over this matter and insist on a definite quota of live talent being used on private stations. I take it your interest is primarily in music and not necessarily in the livelihood of the musicians? I agree this is probably a good stand to take if you are interested primarily in the livelihood of musicians, but apart from that, is there any special virtue in listening to music provided by live talent rather than recorded music? Isn't it better to hear a very high grade performance of an opera or a great symphony by first class musicians rather than hear the same performance of drama and opera by live mediocre musicians?

DR. NEEL: I think in paragraph 6 the emphasis is on the employment of musicians rather than on the music played. Eventually, of course, we would hope to achieve a stage in Canada where the live performance would equal the finest recording available, as it does in some countries elsewhere. That could only come through the live performer being encouraged. It is a vicious circle. If he is never given the chance to perform, he can never improve.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: It is a long range programme?

DR. NEEL: Yes, and I think you must look at paragraph 6 as thinking more of work we can get for our graduates rather than the actual -- naturally, it would automatically mean the music performed would be of a good nature, but I think the emphasis there is on the former rather on music.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: In line with this duty which is on the CBC to encourage talent; you are not thinking of music so much as thinking of encouraging talent for the eventual result of greater musical performance in Canada?

DR. NEEL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: But it may have in the interim the effect of allowing Canadians to hear more mediocre music than otherwise.

DR. NEEL: When I think of a private station I am thinking of a small station somewhere a long way from big centres. When an artist begins his or her career, for instance, take Europe, the operatic singer, he graduates from his conservatory, he goes to a small provincial opera house, perhaps a town of not more than 50,000 people and he works there for two years, maybe no one has heard of the singers he is singing with. In Italy it is the same thing.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: All this is subsidized?

DR. NEEL: Yes, but I am trying to draw an analogy between that and then he graduates and learns his trade and gets better known and moves on to a better opera house and he ends up at La Scala or Covent Garden or whatever is. I was thinking there are little shows put on in the province not at maximum peak hours, and young artists are given a chance to perform; it would naturally be a competent artist but not great. I think we must look at it that way.

MR. de GRANDPRE: In this same paragraph which appears at the bottom of page 3 you make this statement:

"It would seem that if the CBC is to specialize in the more artistic type of programming, the lighter and more popular elements of entertainment should eventually be left to the private stations."

Is this not a very dangerous statement to make in view

of the purpose for which the CBC was created and is there not a danger that it would not fulfil its purpose of being a national broadcasting system? What I have in mind is that a national broadcasting system can mean two things; it can mean national in coverage but it can also mean, and I think it does mean, national in character, and by doing this do you not limit the meaning of culture to the arts and the fine music and the good theatre and exclude the lighter entertainment and sports, which can be considered as part of Canadian culture?

DR. NEEL: Yes, certainly, but I do not think so because you see we have asked for an alternative in paragraph 3, the idea being the CBC should provide all kinds of entertainment. Where we say here that the CBC should specialize, we feel as was so rightly remarked just now that to specialize in the rather better forms of art usually means subsidy, and we look upon the CBC as the source of subsidy for these things rather than the private stations.

statement MR. de GRANDPRE: But, does not your written statement go a little further than the verbal statement you are now making; you take the CBC not as the additional network or the alternative network you have just mentioned, but CBC as a whole, and the private stations should take over the light entertainment?

DR. NEEL: I think perhaps it is not made

quite clear here, the CBC is always considered to have alternative programmes all through this brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but you do say, and I think you have probably varied it, but you say the lighter elements of entertainment should eventually be looked after by the private stations, and what I think Mr. de Grandpre is putting to you is that the CBC being charged with developing a national programme, it would not be truly a national programme if it did not include lighter and more popular elements of entertainment.

DR. NEEL: That is so, sir, that is perhaps badly worded; it does not give the right impression.

MR. de GRANDPRE: What you really have in mind is the CBC on its principal or main network should carry everything which constitutes Canadian culture?

DR. NEEL: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And the Dominion network or the Third Programme network would specialize in the fine music and fine theatre and other similar higher arts?

DR. NEEL: Yes, with these aspects of programming probably left to the CBC rather than the private stations. That is what we really mean.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You say:

"The Royal Conservatory feels that the Opera Festival Association of Toronto, being as it is by far the most important opera-producing

body in Canada, it should be used by the CBC for television and sound performances."

You say "by far the most important", now, I do not know whether that is true or not, it is an expression of opinion and I do not question it, but would it not be possible if there was divided opinion about it in the country, would that not explain at the bottom of the page you refer to the liaison between the Royal Conservatory and the CBC, and it is not as satisfactory as you would like it to be is because there is a difference of opinion or a possible doubt, or there are rival organizations that feel they have as great a call upon public assistance? There must be divided opinion, otherwise this would not happen, you would not be confronted with that situation, would you?

DR. NEEL: Perhaps Dr. Walter can answer that.

DR. WALTER: Perhaps I can be a little helpful in the history of this particular thing. About ten years ago I was instrumental in establishing the Opera School of the Royal Conservatory, out of which all these various operatic developments grew. First of all we produced opera only with our own restricted means in the conservatory in such places as Hart House and so on, and then the CBC was very interested in our work and established at that time what has come to be known as the CBC Opera Company which had its beginnings entirely through the resources of the Royal Conservatory.

This is actually the time we are referring to, at the time we were the only opera school in English-speaking Canada. There existed an opera school and still exists an opera school in Montreal, which is very good, I believe, but by no means on as large a scale as ours. The differences are also these, and I think they are very important, that in Montreal operas which these opera schools -- one by Madame Donalda, you may have heard of it -- when they produce opera there they do use a number of Canadian singers, the whole chorus is Canadian and the orchestral musicians are also, but what they used to do year after year was to bring in from the United States specialists, particularly a stage director, who would come from the Metropolitan Opera, and a few great name singers. In other words, it became not a Canadian opera performance but -- I have nothing against it itself, it is a very nice thing to have in Montreal -- but we operated at that time in such a way that we tried to have everything done right here on our own resources. Now, the CBC actually paid us a compliment of not being interested in it, not being over our resources and start with it at that time, and it is now perhaps eight years ago the CBC Opera Company. Later on they enlarged it very greatly. The closed corporation which had been established in those first years then was somewhat loose, and they went on to do the thing in their own way, which they had a perfect right to do, and nobody is saying anything against this at all, but still the fact remains

that we have the largest opera school here, we have perhaps the best resources available in Canada, and since it was suggested by one of the Commissioners that this is not so, knowing the field pretty well, I would venture to contradict him; that is so. There is no bigger or more important opera school in the country at the present time.

The Royal Conservatory has tried with the help of the University to build up the greatest concentration in this particular field. The school in Montreal is trying to build up an opera school of their own and maybe two or three years from now they will have the same resources, but at the present time we have the priority there.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Turcotte's question really was, if this fact which you very usefully outlined to us exists, why did the CBC move away from Toronto?

DR. WALTER: This is very easy to understand. The CBC always has a problem of trying to give nationwide coverage, and after all this question of fresh talent, years ago in the Massey Report there was a suggestion made that CBC should go out of its way to get away from Montreal and Toronto and to try and sponsor and find talent in other Canadian centres, where they could find them. Naturally, as educators we know this is difficult because you can find talent, but talent to be trained well, not even in Winnipeg, Regina, Vancouver, will they be trained in such a way that it can be put on the air with very

good effect, only in very, very exceptional circumstances; therefore, they will have to come back to Toronto and Montreal every time, in spite of that. They tried to have it both ways. Naturally they cannot win all the time, but it is very interesting.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: But Toronto is one of the two big production centres?

DR. WALTER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: So that just not justify the fact that they go to Montreal. Toronto is equally as big as Montreal as a production centre, so it does not justify the moving away that you refer to. They loosened their contact; why was that? You are talking about equipment or the facilities -- are you referring to physical facilities, the equipment, or the teaching, or simply the fact that one is smaller than the other in actual physical outlay?

DR. WALTER: No; what we would like to see, for instance, is that the CBC would telecast some operatic performance. As you know, that is a very expensive business. Now I think about a year ago the Opera Festival Association was actually cashing in on our educational effort by having other performances which were actually prepared in our studios, and we gave time, facilities, and after all these people are professors at the university, whether stage director, conductor or what not, and it made it actually much better. Therefore, we would think that the CBC would have an advantage. As a matter of fact, we do think that the CBC in many cases

would like to but feels it has to think in terms of geographical representation, which, on the other hand, is naturally understandable.

-

-

(Page 2899 follows)

-

-

-

MR. de GRANDPRE: Taking your last remarks and reading them in conjunction with the last sentence of your paragraph 6, which appears at the top of page 4, how can you reconcile this last statement with your suggestion that all private stations should be regulated to give a proper quota of Canadian live talent if this live talent is only available in the large centres, or, in large measure in the large centres?

DR. WALTER: The first thing, Mr. Chairman, I would say that without the CBC itself, live talent in this country, musically speaking, could not grow up at all. After all, the facts of life in the music business are very strange. We are dominated in this country by American management; there is no way out. Without the CBC there would not be any national market at all -- period! Even as it is every student we bring out, every gifted young Canadian musician, has to compete on the international market. There is an almost intolerable situation for a young person about twenty years of age starting out on his career. In all other walks of life I think a young person competes only in the national market. Because we are dominated by the American market, we compete in an international market from the outset, and it is only CBC at the moment -- particularly I am thinking of instrumentalists, singers and composers -- which stands between this lack of a national market and a possible career for these people. As educators we are very

interested in their careers, because it is silly to educate people for a market which does not exist. Therefore, we would like to increase that market. The private station, in our opinion, ought to do much more about it, and this is where this remark comes from. It is perfectly true that in another part of the brief it is proposed that private stations be written off as a possible source of education. This is the bad odour in which they are with people like ourselves. I don't need to remind you there are two possibilities of looking at broadcasting; one is entertainment philosophy, which they have in the United States, and the other one is our idea, the Canadian idea, of broadcasting being a national trust and a means of education. The private station -- and this came out very plainly in the Massey Report five years ago -- has a very bad record. However, after all, they could be reformed; maybe by some agency they could be persuaded to use more live talent. Nothing better could happen for the development of the Canadian musician -- our charge. Therefore, we look around to see what agency there is which can reform the stations. I don't know whether the CBC has the power to do so. Under the Broadcasting Act of 1936 I understand it has the power, but whether it uses it, that remains to be seen. From our point of view nothing would be more desirable than that, because as it is now they just use recordings and nothing but recordings.

If I may come back to what was said a while

ago, as to whether or not a good recording was much better than a mediocre musician however live, yes, in itself, no doubt; but, if you see it as part of a national scene, no. I am sorry to be so relativistic about it and say "Yes" and "No", because if you have no live musicians you will after a while have only old records repressed time and time again, and I don't need to tell you what this would mean. We are fighting the recordings, although many of them are very beautiful indeed. However, that is absolutely necessary. We need the live musicians but at the same time it is fantastically difficult to find jobs for them in spite of the fact you can prove they are necessary, and that the orchestras need them, and the broadcasters need them, and all the other agencies need them, and yet it is in a situation where it is very difficult to educate people for such a field of endeavour. This is what we are trying to do, and we would like you to understand our remarks in that light.

-

-

-

-

MR. de GRANDPRE: The purpose of my question was slightly different. How do you get to this control which you indicate, force the private stations to give a certain quality of live talent?

DR. WALTER: You mean how do we go about it?

MR. de GRANDPRE: And if you have a certain proportion of live talent for all the private stations and if a private station in a given locality does not have the talent to meet the demand of the quota, how do you go about this problem?

DR. WALTER: It seems to me a very easy thing; suppose there is a private station in a place like Hamilton and they have not got the musicians there in order to fill that quota, well, then, they should offer that job to live musicians; they make their living and their livelihood in that place, and this is naturally precisely what we mean, in the same way that we introduce music teachers or organists into a place where they are needed.

MR. de GRANDPRE: How do you go about it? You offer them a position?

DR. NEEL: The mere fact of the work being there would call for the musician.

MR. de GRANDPRE: We were told that the appeal of the large centres is such that the musicians do not remain in the small centres because they want to perfect their education in the large centres of learning and therefore the talent does not remain in the small centre, and they will always be on the go between the large centres to perfect

their education on one hand and to earn their livelihood on the other.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is really the Royal Conservatory of Music that is responsible for this concentration.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is all, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are sorry to have kept you so late. Thank you very much for your brief and we will consider it.

---The Commission adjourned.

END

I N D E XJUNE 1, 1956

<u>SUBMISSIONS BY:</u>	<u>Page</u>
THE OPERA FESTIVAL ASSOCIATION ...	2696
Mr. Richard S. VanValkenburg.	
Dr. Boyd Neel.	
Mr. Herman Geiger-Torel.	
NATIONAL RELIGIOUS ADVISORY COUNCIL OF C.B.C. ...	2720
Rev. George Borneman	
Rev. J.R. Mutchmor	
Rev. C.V. Farmer	
Rev. Father Lanphier	
UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA ...	2761
Rev. E.E. Long	
Rev. Dr. Kenneth J. Beaton	
SOUTHAM PRESS LIMITED ...	2793
Mr. St.Clair Balfour Jr.	
Mr. Watson Southam	
CANADIAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION ...	2848
Mr. Robert H. Blackburn	
Dr. Freda F. Waldon	
Miss Katherine Ball	
Mr. William L. Graff	
Mrs. John W. Falkner	
Mr. David Foley	
THE ROYAL CONSERVATORY OF MUSIC OF TORONTO ...	2877
Dr. B. Neel	
Dr. Walter	

INDEX TO EXHIBITS

<u>No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
115	Brief of The Opera Festival Association.	2697
116	Brief submitted by The National Religious Advisory Council of the C.B.C.	2720
117	Brief of the United Church of Canada.	2761
118	Brief submitted by Southam Press Limited.	2793
119	Brief of the Canadian Library Association	2848
120	Brief of The Royal Conservatory of Music of Toronto.	2877

ROYAL COMMISSION
ON
BROADCASTING

HEARINGS

HELD AT

TORONTO, ONT.

June 4, 1956

V. 18

MONDAY, JUNE 4, 1956

SUBMISSIONS BY:

ASSOCIATION OF CANADIAN ADVERTISERS

Mr. Peter Wright, Q.C., Counsel
Mr. R. McIntosh, President of ACA

YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF CANADA

Mr. J. S. Angevine, Chairman,
National Programme Services Committee,
Mr. N. F. Cragg, Vice-President
Mr. Donald McGregor
Mr. E. D. McDonald
Mr. S. C. Symington
Mr. R. C. Rae
Mr. H. A. Ward

NORTH YORK HOME AND SCHOOL COUNCIL

Mrs. G. C. Irvine, President
Mrs. T. M. Weatherhead
Mrs. Olive Glaubitz
Mrs. E. C. Schafer
Mr. Lawrie

STATION CKEY

Mr. Jack Kent Cooke

- - - - -

---On resuming at 10.00 a.m.

- - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we will reopen the hearings now. We have only one brief on the agenda for this morning. It is a long and important brief from the Association of Canadian Advertisers. I perhaps should, since you have not all been present throughout the hearings, say a word about our procedure. We try to start at ten o'clock and run through until twelve-thirty or a quarter to one, resuming at two-thirty and go on until we finish the brief for the day in the afternoon. Our procedure

is to have the brief presented, either by reading or by outlining, but fairly fully presented so that they will be fresh in our minds although we have read them, and after that questions are asked, of those who are presenting the briefs. Those questions are intended merely for the purpose of bringing out the exact contention and getting at the facts, and necessarily you can only examine the witness who happens to be before you at the time. To some extent, therefore, the questioning may appear to be from a sort of opposite point of view. That should not be taken as indicating that the Commission has reached any conclusions at all, but merely a method of arriving at the exact contentions that are being put forward by the witness and to be sure that the various other matters have been considered by the witness in making the recommendations which they are making.

Now I understand that Mr. McKinnon ---

MR. McINTOSH: It is Mr. McIntosh, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. McIntosh, I am sorry. I haven't the sheet in front of me with the names. I understand you are President of the Association.

MR. McINTOSH: That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you will perhaps introduce the group and explain something of the nature of your organization, and then Mr. Wright is going to present the brief. How do you wish to proceed?

MR. McINTOSH: That will be fine, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: You do not need to stand as

far as we are concerned.

MR. McINTOSH: Right. My name is Roger McIntosh, current President of the Association of Canadian Advertisers and Vice-President of General Foods Limited. It is my pleasure now, gentlemen, to introduce to you some of the officers and directors of this Association. Like any Association of our size they are naturally located in various cities in Canada and for that reason we don't have a full representation of our Board.

First I would like to introduce Mr. R. E. Sewell, Executive Vice-President of the Association and Vice-President and Managing Director of Coca-Cola Company Limited; Mr. H. E. Whitehead, Vice-President and Treasurer, Association of Canadian Advertisers, and Vice-President of Kimberley-Clark Corporation of Canada Limited; Mr. R. E. Jones, Past President of the ACA, Vice-President of Colgate-Palmolive Limited; Mr. Scott Fyfe, Advertising Manager, Imperial Oil Limited, and Director of ACA; Mr. Frank A. Healy, General Manager and Secretary, Association of Canadian Advertisers; Mr. J. E. Potts, Advertising Manager of Pepsodent Division of Lever Brothers and Chairman of the Joint Committee on Radio and Television.

I would ask Mr. Potts to present our speakers.

MR. POTTS: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, first may I express the satisfaction of our organization in the arrangements which have been made for us

to be present here today. Thank you for that.

Now, as an Association the ACA is composed of many diverse manufacturing services and interests and it has been considered desirable, therefore, that we should be represented by a spokesman who would not be identified directly with any one of the particular companies. We have therefore requested Mr. Peter Wright to act in that capacity as our counsel. In our estimation Mr. Wright has had as broad a background in the broadcasting field as anyone in the legal profession. He has acted as counsel for the Massey Commission, also acted for the CBC on a number of occasions. We are therefore confident that he will be able to present the views of the ACA on radio and television, and with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call upon Mr. Wright.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are very glad to have you here, and your delegation is a full one. Mr. McIntosh, we appreciate your bringing them along, also the fact that you have this brief which is detailed and carefully worked out, and Mr. Potts we will be very glad to hear the brief presented by Mr. Wright. The exhibit number we better assign now -- Exhibit No. 121.

EXHIBIT NO. 121: Brief of the Association of Canadian Advertisers.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say at the outset that I am speaking on behalf of the Association, but there is one member on whose behalf I am instructed and understand I am not speaking to; that is the Steel Company of Canada Limited.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wright, I am glad you mentioned that because I have a letter from the Vice-President of the Steel Company referring to this brief of yours and referring to the fact that their name is listed in the list of members, and ending with the statement: "This letter is to advise your Commission that the brief of the Association of Canadian Advertisers does not represent the views of this Company." So I think we have that on the record now.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, sir. Leaving that exception out of mind, I am speaking generally for 170 of the businesses in Canada that depend on having friendly relations with the Canadian public and I think that is a basic factor in any presentation by advertisers, what advertising in their business means both generally and in relation to their products is this factor of friendly relations with Canadians. Secondly, as you will see from the list of members, I am also speaking for the largest users of Canadian TV at the present time, most of the national advertisers, whose sponsored programmes are appearing now on the national networks.

There is one other point I would like to make clear, which must be clear to anyone who looks at the list of members, that is the concern of the members of the ACA is very much broader than broadcasting or advertising. They are in every type of important Canadian industrial life, they are interested in every factor of Canadian life, and particularly interested in every factor that has to do

with a productive enterprise.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean, Mr. Wright, that that is their business. They have their concerns but in their brief here they are concerned with broadcasting?

MR. WRIGHT: That is right. Sir, what I am endeavouring to say is that they are not people who are in their everyday business solely concerned with the business of broadcasting and the advertising business; while it is an extremely important factor, they have a vast number of other interests which concern the whole of Canadian life.

THE CHAIRMAN: In this case they are speaking, they are very interested in broadcasting. You are not saying they are appearing here as amicus curae?

MR. WRIGHT: No, although they do stand in a somewhat different position than those in the daily business of broadcasting and conducting broadcasting stations of one kind or another.

I would like to say something about the brief. The first five pages of the brief I could call the main brief and they hold in the sense in which I shall describe as the general submissions of the Association held in common. We have put into annexes arguments and facts not necessarily unanimous because an argument to support a matter of 170 different business in Canada is not likely invariably to agree. I would like to say what we have done about the brief is to endeavour to say that it does represent the opinion of our members. It was

prepared by the Joint Committee or under the direction of the Joint Committee, headed by Mr. Potts. This Committee held six long and well attended committee meetings, both in Toronto and Montreal; that is twelve in all, and a great deal of work was done and a great deal of opinion was canvassed at those meetings, and it was approved largely in the form, almost entirely in the form, submitted to you, and was then sent out to the members and they were invited to attend meetings to discuss it in Toronto. That meeting was held and a number of the members attended. There was a discussion and there was approval. The brief has been approved by the Board of Directors on two occasions, so I would like to say that the first five pages represent the common thinking as far as it is able to get it in any organization of this kind; with the exception mentioned there has been no dissent registered with regard to any part of the brief which is submitted, and of course my own remarks have no more authority than I am able to give them by reason of lowering my voice or raising it from time to time.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would not say that, Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: The position of the Advertisers before the Commission is, as appears from the brief, not a particularly contentious one. They are not asking for anything. They are trying to point out really one thing, that commercial revenue comes from business principles in commerce. The important points in the brief are the Canadian importance of

Canada's trade and commerce, the need for competition and competitive stations and for special French language support. I want to emphasize that we are not supporting or opposing other submissions. There is a tendency at times for cases to be taken before Commissions of this kind, and for people to line up on one side or another. We are not lining up on any of the sides that have been presented before you. We wish as far as possible not to add to the contention which this subject has aroused. I would like to suggest, with all the sincerity I can muster, that one of the best results that the sittings of this Commission could have, would be the resolution of many of the arguments that have been aired before you because I think most people would agree one of the things wrong with the Canadian Broadcasting in its day-to-day operation is the sort of professional ill feeling that has evidenced itself before you and does evidence itself in the press, and this is something that is a real difficulty, and the advertisers, standing a little aside but still in the arena, are very much with me when I make this statement that anything that could be done to make this a real partnership and make the people in it feel that they are engaged in a common endeavour would be a tremendous help. There has been progress, but it is just a feature of Canadian broadcasting.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean by that, do you, Mr. Wright, that you are talking there about both the CBC and the private broadcaster as being members

in this, really feeling as members in this partnership; were they the ones?

MR. WRIGHT: And the advertisers, all those who are concerned, there are a great number of people concerned in it, and on almost every occasion when I get a look at it it looks rather more like -- I would not say the Battle of Flodden or Bosworth Field, some more equal struggle than those taking place, and a certain amount of contention, a certain amount of competition and a certain amount of different points of view is extremely important and considered important in these fields, and I shall be asking for it. We are very anxious not to add to the contention; we are anxious to point out it is one of the things in this degree that is wrong in Canadian broadcasting.

Now I have set out in the notes I have furnished you the course of the argument I wish to address to you. I am not reading the brief, I am basing my argument on it. This is the course of the argument I wish to develop. The National Broadcasting policy is a Canadian policy designed primarily not to protect or advance any particular aspect of Canadian life, but to keep Canada Canadian and to make it more strongly Canadian.

On the other hand, the most powerful external influences in Canadian broadcasting are American broadcasting tastes and way of life. These, I suggest, are two fundamental factors that have faced everyone examining this question in Canada. Now the second point, and it is one of

our premises, is that one of the basic aspects of Canadian life is trade and commerce and a vital and important aspect of presentday Canadian trade and commerce is the advertising of goods and services. And our third course of argument is that advertising can support Canadian television to any reasonable extent provided that commercial principles and the fundamental purpose of advertising are recognized.

A ready solution of the present problem presented to this Commission lies in the measures which can ensure an increase within the national policy the commercial revenue that is available. Lastly, television, Canada and society are all so on the march that today's solutions should be reviewed three to five years hence.

I must say that in our consideration of the problems that are raised by the Order in Council this was a most comforting thought that we came across, that we did not feel that it was our purpose to try at this time to devise something that would be valid in the developments which we all anticipate will take place in the field. We respectfully submit the Commission may find similar comfort despite the submissions made to it against that view.

THE CHAIRMAN: On that point of reviewing this, do you think it is not possible to lay down a road that could be followed without the need of these continual inquiries and so forth in regard to this whole subject for so many years. I am feeling sympathetic for the next Royal Commission.

MR. WRIGHT: I do not want to discourage the Commission from arriving at a solution that will be valid for years to come. You ask me "did I really think it" -- yes, I think you will not be able to arrive at a solution that will be valid for years to come. The reason is you are dealing in a field where it is impossible to anticipate what is going to happen.

First, and on the technical side, as far as we could discover and assess we are at the beginning, not at the end of the technical development. We are faced, not faced -- we are charmed by the prospect of colour television and video tape and all sorts of scientific developments. That is not the thing that makes it so difficult to give a decision today forever. The real reason is this, this is a medium that operates with human beings and it may well be possible to anticipate how human beings are going to act under every stress and development of human life in this revolutionary age -- if you can, excuse me -- if you can do it good luck to you. I don't think it can be done.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have no illusions about it, Mr. Wright, but it does seem to me that one of the difficulties in this whole subject, which you must be conscious of in your own personal thinking, is the continual atmosphere of contention which exists and which is perhaps maintained and fanned a little bit by the endless series of inquiries that take place, also a certain amount of expense connected

with these things, and we are concerned with expense.

MR. WRIGHT: May I address myself just to that. I would like to deal with any of these things as you raise them. I would like to say this, I think you will appreciate in some of my comments I am not speaking with the united voice of 170 Canadian businesses behind me, I am speaking with some knowledge of this matter of the investigation of broadcasting. It is the opposite side of the coin and the entrustment of this tremendous public power to any body, and when I hear the complaints that fall on unsympathetic ears, that is the price that anyone must pay who enjoys this kind of privilege in Canada and the responsibility to Parliament of the national broadcasting agency is set out in the Order in Council and is fundamental, the way in which that responsibility is charged normally is by responding to the Radio Committee of the House of Commons. This does take a tremendous amount of public money and time and effort, which could be going into good broadcasting.

The real reason is one that I would not surrender, and that is that no one should enjoy those privileges without having to account for them, and as a taxpayer I am only too happy to pay money for that accounting. There is a function that the Royal Commission, as against parliamentary committees, can perform; it has an essentially non-political view of the problems and that leads me

up to what I am about to say. A particular problem has been given to the Commission, that has been our interpretation -- you have been given the task of finding the answer to one question: How do we pay for national television or television in Canada? That is something that is particularly susceptible of solution by a Commission of this kind, and perhaps particularly difficult of solution by a Committee of the House of Commons.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would think you would agree while that is perhaps the essential feature of our Terms of Reference it is not confined entirely to finance.

MR. WRIGHT: No, it is not confined to finance entirely, but with respect it seems to me as it is drafted you are only invited to look at the other ones as you find that is necessary from a financial point of view. It is primarily "How do we finance television?"

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't want to get into a detailed argument with you about the Terms of Reference, but there are several headings admittedly that deal with finance and some that have no relationship directly to finance at all. I didn't want to pass your statement that we are confined to finance as being the sole issue before us.

MR. WRIGHT: We don't suggest that you are confined to finance. I think I would venture to say that if you did not deal with the financial problems in television you would not have been asked

to do the job. We are particularly concerned with it although we are not unmindful of the many other national interests and concerns that are entrusted to you and to anyone who is concerned with broadcasting in Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have been interrupting you, Mr. Wright. I will try not to.

MR. WRIGHT: I would welcome that. That is one of the reasons I provided the notes so we can all get back together again.

Now, a fundamental point in our position is the fact that at the present time TV broadcasting in Canada is being financed at the rate of \$40 million a year from advertisers, more of the current annual expense than any other single source and probably more than all others together. That is the present position and that is the position I have made the Association feel that it was very much its duty on this occasion to step forward and say what the advertisers were doing and thinking and what they were ready to do because it goes -- the \$40 million, it is part of the present day solution which is not a solution. I will be submitting that it could be a very much greater solution, and I will be submitting the atmosphere in which we submit it could be done.

Now I would like to develop very briefly the point we made in our brief. There are three types of solution that in a sense are open, but it is our submission that two of them are closed. One

solution is to make Canadian broadcasting all commercial. We are not suggesting that. The terms of the Order in Council and history of the matter in Canada does not make it a practical solution at the present time.

The second is to make, as has been submitted to you, make the broadcasting system of Canada wholly non-commercial. Now we have said in our brief the best argument as to why it should not be non-commercial, which is contained in the Massey Report -- those Commissioners who were concerned not with the commercial matters at all, after examining it came very cogently to the conclusion that this was just impossible in Canada quite apart from any doctrinaire it was practically impossible, as they put it, as long as there is a system of commercial broadcasting across the border. There are other reasons for it, and in this particular instance there is a quite powerful new reason that did not exist at the time of the Massey Report, that is the licensing of the private stations which now provide a very substantial part of the area coverage of Canadian television, and which depend entirely on commercial revenue. They are a new factor, but our position with regard to it is that the statement in the Masset Report, pages 290 and 291, is a reasonably good argument, or is the argument which we adopt.

Then I have taken the two extremes only to say I think it must become common ground very early that the solution which is open to you has to

be a compromise solution and therefore we have devoted ourselves to discussing the factors which we feel are important in considering that, and the first factor that we want to discuss is "What is the basic Canadian broadcasting policy". I think this is a field of argument in which most Canadians worthy of the name can find themselves in agreement, but I think we should be united in our understanding of what should be the object of Canadian broadcasting policy.

You have had all sorts of objects suggested to you, and in order to make it clear exactly what I am trying to say I would like to say what I think it is not. I can see an argument on almost every one of them. I will say it is not public ownership or the ideas that are associated with it. I say it is not to continue and preserve free enterprise. I say it is not primarily to educate or inform. I say it is not primarily to sell goods. I say it is not to fill our channels. I say it is not to arouse Canadian talent and eventually the bold statement it is not even in its primary sense to provide national service. All these are secondary to the primary purpose of our broadcasting, that is the maintenance of Canada as a distinct and independent country and our broadcasting policy is one of the most important factors in the whole basis problem facing Canada and Canadians, that is to preserve the integrity of Confederation and keep Canada Canadian. This has been the cornerstone of Canadian policy from the time the Dominion Government

came into being, and it is now the touchstone of Canadian policy, and I ventured when I was first speaking to the Massey Commission to quote from D'Arcy McGee, who was the greatest orator on Confederation, the man who expressed the idea that was behind Confederation, and in an extemporaneous speech he gave at the station in Montreal when he arrived back in 1865 he expressed what I submit is the basic underlying policy behind our country, and this is what he said:

"Many of the young men here to-day will live to see the proof of what I am about to state, that all other politics that have been preached in British America will grow old and lose their lustre, but the conciliation of class and class, the policy of linking together all our people in one solid chain, and making up for the comparative paucity of our numbers, being as we are a small people in this respect, by the moral influence of our unity; the policy of smoothing down the sharp and wounding edges of hostile prejudices; the policy of making all feel an interest in the country and each man in the character of each section of the community, and of each other -- each for all and all for each -- this policy never will

grow old, never will lose its lustre.

The day never will come when the excellence of its beauty will depart, so long as there is the geographical denomination of Canada."

Now that was the idea at Confederation, and that is the real idea behind our having a separate broadcasting policy in Canada and having a separate broadcasting system, and in the broadest sense the real reason for the broadcasting system is a political one, a basic political one.

The first policy of the Canadian Government is to keep Canada Canadian. That is one of the instruments that Parliament has created to do it and I emphasize this because I think it must be apparent to the members of the Commission this is not now a universal view and you have a number of people explaining all sorts of other things. True, they are related to Canada but still not essentially Canadian. That is the real purpose of our broadcasting policy.

Now it is this policy that inspired the Aird Report and that inspired the Massey Report, and it shines in the face of the Orders in Council that have set up the last two Commissions, and the advertisers, like everyone else, in my submission, must accept that as the universal one in Canadian broadcasting. We are not advocating it; I am saying it is there and it exists and it is what is set up, and we as advertisers accept it and we make our submissions to you under it and under that under-

standing of it. In some aspects we come to the very important policies that have developed under it, that we use our broadcasting for the dissemination of news and information; we use it for education, the marketing of goods, the development of Canadian talent; we use it for Canadian creative work, but all these are justified in the National Broadcasting policy by the policy that D'Arcy McGee expressed, and that is the whole first policy of our country. Many of these things can be served in those geographical areas without any Canadian stress at all; it is the Canadian stress that has created the policy.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure I follow what you mean. All these things could be served ---

MR. WRIGHT: News could be provided without necessarily a Canadian news covering and disseminating body, although news is not perhaps the best one -- education could be provided, talent could be provided, creative work could be encouraged, by the Canadian factor in each one that has created the national system.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I wonder if you are right in saying -- I don't want to get into a detailed argument with you -- are you right in saying these are secondary factors, are they not specific elements that go to make up the overall policy, they are part and parcel?

MR. WRIGHT: They are the field in which the policy is worked out. I think it is perfectly evident why I find this interpretation which is not

one that has been dreamed up for the advertisers particularly agreeable, because the advertisers in Canadian trade and commerce are just as Canadian as all these other things, and their assistance is just as important in the carrying out of the national policy behind the National Broadcasting as the help of all the other groups and bodies that have come before you, and I think from our point of view, I think it is a universal point of view, it is quite an important way of looking at it.

-

(Page 2924 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: I can agree with that remark, it is perfectly clear to me, and it is very valuable to have this clearcut statement of the situation that you have given us. I am only raising the question as to your suggestion that these other items were in a sense secondary, I am saying part and parcel of the basic theory you are putting forward, and that while it is valuable to have you state the overall approach so clearly, most valuable, the fact is that with very few exceptions I would doubt if people who have appeared before us so far would quarrel with your basic statement even though they might not articulate it as well as you have, but they have been devoting themselves to certain specific aspects as they have gone along, which are part and parcel, I would think, of the very thing you are saying.

MR. WRIGHT: As I would like to say, we are all under one umbrella, we are not under some other fellow's umbrella. Now, I meant to say something about the second factor, and it enables me to say something about two other Royal Commissions that have reported on this. The second external factor in Canada that affects our broadcasting and that will continue to affect it is the geographical and economic factor of Canada on the North American Continent, and whether we like it or do not like it, there is a strong and real influence to the American way of life on our ways. This could be a good or a bad thing, but it is a thing and it

exists. It has twice shown its power and powers in our national broadcasting policy; the first time was in the policy following the Aird Report. Now, the Aird Report recommended that direct advertising -- well, it recommended that the private stations should be expropriated and that direct advertising as they called it should not obtain in Canada and that there should be indirect advertising which was the privilege of having a sponsor's name mentioned in connection with a programme otherwise produced.

Now, at that time the private stations were not a large or powerful force in Canada. The advertisers were not exercising themselves in this field, but what happened under the policy of the Aird Report? In twenty years in Canada, after twenty years there were 129 private stations that were to be expropriated, they had assets of \$27 million and there was more than \$16 million being spent annually on direct advertising. Now, what was the reason? The reason was the point I have made, that our life is lived in the North American climate and no matter how we may decide, this way or that way, the real power of the society in which we live has some effect, and in this particular case had the effect I have defined.

The Aird Report said what those commissioners would like to see in Canada; substantially and in principle that is what we did see in Canada, but this particular field that I am dealing with was a field that survived in Canada in a healthy way and directly

contrary to the commissioners' recommendations, and I say that was not through any census or even conscious movement, that was because these are factors which we do not create in Canada but which move us.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you not think the date of the Aird Report had something to do with it?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, that has been suggested -- well, someone, I think, has suggested that the Aird Report rose out of the depression.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, as I recall it the Aird Report came out just before the depression, and the possibility -- well, Canada was busy with a lot of other things then than taking over the private broadcasters in the period immediately following the Aird Report.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, that may be so, although the real developments in private broadcasting did not come until very much later.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am just saying it may not only be the North American climate as you call it, although I think you could use a better word than "climate" ---

MR. WRIGHT: No, I am not suggesting it is the only, but it is the most powerful element in that result. Now, somewhat the same type of thing happened in connection with the Massey Report, perhaps for different reasons, perhaps not. Now, it is true, as I have said, in the Massey Report the fact that a total non-commercial system could not be so in Canada was recognized, but I think it is equally true and I naturally do not say it in any

tone of criticism, that the tone of the Massey Report is essentially anti-commercial. Certainly in broad commercial things we are concerned with an entirely different matter and they expressed themselves on a number of occasions against the commercial development, but after five years of television development following out their recommendation there are now 26 private stations, television broadcasting stations, in Canada entirely dependent on commercial revenue, and \$40 million a year is being spent. I think it is for the same kind of reason that the pattern of our broadcasting and the pattern of our case, the pattern of our economic life is a pattern which we cannot completely alter and which we do not in the first instance determine. We get a distinctively Canadian system or point of view but we have to get in the light or shadow of an American frame. It is just one of the factors in television that our people are familiar with American television, they are familiar with American methods of buying and selling, familiar with the American advertising, and you can try as you will to get away from it but you cannot get away from it as long as we are so closely situated beside them.

I am not arguing for it, I am merely saying it is an inescapable factor that as far as I can see has altered the recommendations or altered the possibility of carrying out the recommendations of the last two Commissions on

this subject.

Now, I have spoken of compromise, and there is a second compromise; on the one hand we must have a distinct Canadian system to carry out our national policy, on the other hand we must recognize the influence of American broadcasting and ways of life -- of American broadcasting and ways of life in the lives of Canadians. I am sure that you will have found that these two things are reflected by the witnesses who come before you from all over Canada, some much more susceptible to the second, and most of them, I think, most conscious of the first. They both exist and they both have to be dealt with.

Now then, I have another head of argument, and I have been whipped on to develop this at great length. This is that the basic character in Canadian life is our trade and commerce, but I must confess that I find it very embarrassing to have to start in as if the members of the Commission were not aware of this fact and sort of ogle them into the view that many of their other activities have some relation to Canadian life. I am quite prepared to present it if it is necessary, but we have put it in as a major premise and I am ready to answer questions on it, but unless you want me to argue it I will leave it as a premise.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether you can ever convince Mr. Stewart of this.

MR. WRIGHT: I must confess that that name ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I am only speaking for myself, I am sure others will agree that you certainly do not need to argue, you would have a difficult time in arguing that trade and commerce was not a basic factor in Canadian life.

MR. WRIGHT: That is right. I think the other thing I wanted to say is, trade and commerce is no less Canadian than any other factor in Canadian life, and this is something that I doubt very much if it has appeared in a good number of submissions made before you. There are a great number of people who, with great justice, come before you and say that the needs of the mind are more important than material things and therefore weight should be given to them, and most responsible people are not prepared to deny the validity of that point of view but it is a point of view that has to be held in balance in Canada because of the basic kinds of trade and commerce in Canada. I think it goes without saying that the fundamental background within our country in which this problem is being discussed, or almost any other problem, is what is the country producing, and the country is producing from its trade and commerce, it is not producing from very many other things.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it seems to me you could make the same kind of statement about any country.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you are applying it to the United Kingdom or the United States or Western Germany and came up with the bald statement that a basic factor in Australian life is trade and commerce, everyone would have to agree with you. It depends really on how you apply that very general and readily accepted statement to the particular problem under consideration.

MR. WRIGHT: I think if I may just pick that one up, the relation of trade and commerce to Canada in its present stage of development is probably much greater than in some of the other countries that you have mentioned. We are a country that is forging forward and making tremendous advances, but they are based on our trade and our commerce. Other countries many years ago were in the stage that we are at today, but there is the trade and commerce of our country that is building up what today many Canadians are proud of. I am not trying to argue for any superiority in trade and commerce. I am just saying it is as good as anything else.

THE CHAIRMAN: The real question is what you mean by -- what use you make of the phrase "a basic factor". If you are making of it something that is as good as anything else, which you just said, if you are saying that it is an absolutely

essential factor but not necessarily the only factor -- but if you are driving it to the point of saying this is basic and nothing under any circumstances infringe upon it, then you may get into other difficulties and arguments.

MR. WRIGHT: These are difficulties that I shall not get in because that is not what I say. I am simply saying, and pursuing this because with the point of view that is reflected in the last two reports, I have felt that I have to make a little progress in this direction. In other words, those reports have relegated encouragement of trade and commerce and the support of advertising to a secondary position, and I am not asking that it should have a primary position; I am saying let's all be secondary together.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Our Terms of Reference are entirely different from the other two, and I think they dealt with trade and commerce if finance is part of trade and commerce.

THE CHAIRMAN: The comment I would make at the moment, your statement that trade and commerce is a basic factor in Canadian life would be pretty readily accepted. We are not accepting anything, or rejecting anything. We are merely discussing. If, however, you are trying to say trade and commerce is the basic factor in Canadian life as applied to broadcasting, then you would probably run into more argument from some directions.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. I have already been

warned off that, and I have already backed away and bowed.

Now, the second feature of this argument is that advertising is an established and essential part of national economy in business.

The greatest argument for that is the actual existence of this Association, formed as it is from Canadian businesses in all types of trade and commerce, who yet have considered it sufficiently important for them to form this very active Association for the study and promotion of advertising jointly. They have engaged in a good number of expensive pursuits in common because each one of these businesses knows that advertising is an essential part of its commercial prosperity, and when you have 170 of them of the character of those set out in Annex A, you have a very powerful vote by a very large section of the business community as to what they think is important in their own businesses.

I would also like to make the point that advertising is an essential to the present rate of our economy. I think it is perfectly evident that particularly in consumer goods, a tremendous amount of our prosperity is brought about by the creation of demands through advertising. One of the features of our economic life at the present time is the rate -- has been the rate of our economic advance and the speed with which it is moving at the present time.

I then think there is no doubt advertising has been a very important factor, and all the persons

who instruct me assure me that it is going to continue to be a very important factor in their business and the prosperity of those businesses. We don't say that advertising or trade and commerce is more important than other aspects, but it is an essential and significant part of Canadian life, and we say that as much consideration in broadcasting policies and practices should be given to Canadian trade and commerce and its need to advertise as to any other national need.

It is easy to relate advertising to our national welfare, and that is why we are here. We are not saying it should control it. We are not saying to direct unwisely, but we are saying in any consideration trade and commerce in advertising is just as worthy of serious respectful consideration as any other factor that is advanced. That is our point.

Now, there is one further point I want to make in terms of money, although there is not anything but an automatic connection between it. We have estimated, as I have said, \$40 million as being spent in television advertising in Canada today in various ways. Now, generally in this continent I think it is recognized that two per cent is a fair proportion of advertising to the total sales in business, and strangely enough in the United States at least two per cent of the gross national product is spent in advertising.

Now, that is not to say that the advertising

creates the gross national product that is presented by extending the figure of two per cent, but there has been established a relationship. The strange thing is if you took \$40 million being spent in television advertising it represents -- does not create, it would not perhaps destroy -- but it does represent \$2 billion of the gross national product. And I only whistle these statistics around to show that there are statistics too as well as D'Arcy McGee, and my other props available to assist me, but it is an interesting thing and really the \$40 million extended to \$2 billion really depends on the effectiveness of the advertising. If the advertising is effective, the relationship between two per cent and \$40 million would be found if one cared to make the experiment to be exact.

THE CHAIRMAN: The figure is \$2 billion?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. I am sorry, this comes to -- I went to school in this province when mathematics were not as modern as they are today, and I got another figure when I worked this out, and it should be \$2 billion. I was ready to argue it should be \$200 million, but I see it is \$2 billion.

THE CHAIRMAN: One question. You mentioned the figure of two per cent in the United States. Is that figure all television advertising?

MR. WRIGHT: No, this is the figure of all advertising. I am saying if all advertising represents two per cent, well then the television content of it represents also a proportion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. I am surprised at the two per cent. I thought it was much higher than that in the United States.

MR. WRIGHT: I am sorry, I would just like to submit this two per cent. I have some authority for it.

Now then, I want to say something about what advertising is trying to do. I think I have already made the point ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you going to be dealing with this \$40 million again, or is this the last time?

MR. WRIGHT: No, I shall be referring to it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was reserving some questions on that later, and I will want you to do that. I think you had better go on with your presentation and come back to it.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. I hope I have made the point, because outside of this human demonstration around me, I don't know that I can do very much more than say an advertiser is just the same as any other citizen of Canada; they are not sinister; they do not represent anything very much different from any other group of Canadians, and they have no sinister designs on the national broadcasting policy. What they are trying to do -- they are business men in charge of businesses that mean a good deal to Canada -- and what they are trying to do is induce Canadians to use their goods and services, Canadian goods and services. The point in relation to broadcasting is extremely simple

to the degree that Canadians want and watch Canadian programmes and advertisers will support them. There is no mystery about the advertisers' position. The advertiser would be delighted if 90 per cent of Canadians were listening or watching shows built around Beethoven's Ninth Symphony -- the advertisers would be delighted to support it. There difficulty is that 90 per cent of the Canadians are not yet following that type of programme, and the kind of programme that advertisers are interested in is the kind of programme Canadians are looking at, whatever it is. So that the advertiser does not come in on a long-term basis and say, "There is only one kind of programme Canadians want to look at, and therefore that is what we ought to have for all time forward," but he comes along and says, "I would support any programme that enough Canadians are looking at. I will support it by advertising", and I would like to deal for a moment with this factor of advertising.

When it was interpreted that the CBC were asking for \$15 licence fee, cries and calls could be heard all over Canada, that this was a shocking thing. But the fact is that somebody has to pay for broadcasting. Now, the advertiser says he will pay for broadcasting that enough people will look at, and he pays or he will pay for it, but the public have to pay for it, and they have to pay for it in somewhat a different way, that is the way that is popularly put forward, that the public are the customers of the advertisers, and it gets into the

press, and therefore the public pay for it anyway.

The public really, I think, do not find that the price factor that is passed on to them because of advertising is a tremendous factor, but where the public have to pay for broadcasting that is paid for by advertisers is by accepting or suffering or enjoying the commercial messages, and the people who object to paying \$15 or \$33 or \$45, or whatever it will cost per set to pay for Canadian broadcasting on the basis that has been put forward, can pay for programmes which enough of them are looking at by looking at the advertising. That is how they do the paying. That is the contribution they make, and if they want the programme that is how they get it.

Now, some of them may find that disagreeable -- apparently they do -- but we all find a good number of things disagreeable in life and yet we have to weigh on the one hand, if we are prepared to pay the price for what it is we are getting. Now, the type of programme that advertisers can support because it is popular, the payment for that is looking at the commercial message, and it becomes the advertisers' duty to say by looking at it that they get value for paying for the programme. That is the nub of the thing.

There is a good deal to be said. Once we admit the Canadian factor, there is not very much in my opinion to be said against Canadian advertising programmes. It is just one, and I would have thought about as easy a way to pay for programmes

as it is possible to get, and I am sure the supporters of the Toronto and Vancouver symphony orchestras, in so far as support does come from commercial sources, are very pleased and happy that it is made available. It does not harm or hurt.

THE CHAIRMAN: This does not fall in your opinion under the heading of cruel and unnatural punishment?

MR. WRIGHT: Are you referring to my remarks?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, no. I am referring to the advertising message which is putting in somewhat a different light than modes of payment.

MR. WRIGHT: That leads on to the real factor that every advertiser has to admit if his message is repulsive he had better get off the air. And he has tried with some success on occasion to provide a message that is attractive and is agreeable.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point I was trying to suggest to you is this: you need to go forward as to the nature of the message if this is the type of payment that is being made.

MR. WRIGHT: I am only giving a personal opinion, but it is my personal opinion that the commercial messages and the commercials on television are in this aspect which we are now discussing very much more agreeable to the people. I say it is only a personal thing, but if attention is paid to the commercial message I have found them quite interesting. I also find that television makes such a demand on me that I am just as happy to be

taken away from the particular programme for a moment, just as in the theatre people can go out and smoke cigarettes and gossip about what Millie is wearing. They do not sit in firm intensify trying to maintain the tempo of the first act. But that is only an opinion.

What can advertisers do? This is the question that has been raised before you and raised by the Commission on a number of occasions, and I have, at some of the meetings which I have referred to, sought answers from those who are in the advertising business. Now, the first point is the present rate of spending will only continue if there is return for the advertising dollar. The second point that rate of advertising spending can be increased many times and the authority that we suggest develops that is what happened in the United States, which is set out in page 16 of the brief where you have an all-commercial system, and you have from 1949 to 1954 an expenditure on television increase from \$59 million to \$810 million, fourteen times in all. Every year more than one-third. So that if, and to the extent our society is similar to that in the United States, you have this potential of increase in revenue from commercial sources. We are not saying whether that is the solution you should adopt. We are not saying it should be an all-commercial system, but we are saying that in these figures and in the opinion of those who instruct me, there is money available for Canadian television that

Canadians are looking at, and that the present rate may be increased many times.

There is in fact available much more business for the network, but for shows that attract the Canadian public on a business basis. This is a matter which was dealt with -- may I deal with that in questions, or I have a note of it here. This was dealt with by Mr. Dunton and Mr. Ouimet. I would really like to read their answers, because I think their answers do not really materially differ from this statement. They said there was not more business because they had one show and two half shows that were not taken up and were available. But they say on a number of occasions -- and Mr. Ouimet particularly says it -- for the type of programme they had there is not this problem.

Now, I think their experience speaks for itself, but I am instructed that there is a substantial further demand for network providing the shows and programmes were, in the jargon that I now use, delivering the audience. If that kind of show can be produced in Canada, then there is a demand. It is not a limitless demand by any means, but there is a demand for more than is now being made available.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not quite understand. I think there are some words slipped out of these notes. There is in fact much more business for the network.

MR. WRIGHT: If you care to put in the

words "but it is for shows that attract the Canadian public".

Of course there is a vast amount of revenue untapped in Canadian television system. There is revenue for second stations in major television centres. Ones have been given to me as particular revenue-producing would be Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg and Vancouver. We have pointed out that there is a demand which is not being met in more cities; whether it is a demand that would justify another station or not is a question of debate. I can only say on behalf of my clients in these cities there is a demand for more television than is available. In the cities there is undoubtedly -- in these cities there is a great deal of untapped revenue available offered to the CBC on a more commercial basis, or available to a private station, and certainly in Toronto available to both. I would almost say in any practical sense without limit in Toronto.

You only need to look at any comparable American city and see the maintenance of television stations from commercial revenue in comparable cities.

Now, the next point I want to make is, I am sorry, contrary to Mr. Dunton's opinion. Mr. Dunton's opinion expressed in Ottawa was that the effect of using the untapped revenue available by opening other stations, second stations, would decrease the demand for network commercial shows. Now, I have discussed this as carefully as I could

with the representative groups that I am in touch with in the advertising business, and they do not agree. They think the demand for commercial network would continue at the same level, whatever that may be, depending on the shows, whether they were private stations in the main centres or not, the fundamental being we have in Canada a number of people who are national advertisers and who have to use national network, and the fact that they might be able to save something by restricting their advertising to four markets or three markets is something that is unacceptable if they want to sell their products all over Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: Isn't one of the main complaints made the fact that a lot of your people are writing in to say they do not want to take the full network, they want to be able to pick and choose?

MR. WRIGHT: That is perfectly so. Ones who are now using the network, I am told that most of them would continue to use the network, and there would be additional ones develop and use private stations. It is quite true there are a number of people -- and there I don't know the identity of the letter writer -- but I assume quite a number of those are people who don't want the network. There are all sorts of advertisers in Canada who do only want principal cities or only want one city, and they are the people who are specifically complaining in that regard. But there is the national network user who is now supporting the network.

THE CHAIRMAN: Present national network user, according to your brief, and I do not know where the truth lies in this thing -- I am trying to find out. Your brief says the present national network user is chafing under the restrictions which compel him to go out across the full network. He wants to pick and choose. You now say that if there were alternate stations of which he could pick and choose, it would not affect the demand for commercial network shows.

MR. WRIGHT: I think on this point the distinction is this; there is the complaint expressed in our brief that one of the present difficulties that is growing, if you are a national network user, you are forced to take a good number of markets in which you may not be able to sell your products at all. I am sorry that when I spoke of national network, I think I am speaking on the basis that we are putting it forward; namely national network for commercial purposes, to be a national network which can be used for commercial purposes in the principal areas in Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is quite different from what I thought you were putting forward. I think we will come back to this in questions.

MR. WRIGHT: There is a firm demand for programmes not now open for sponsorship. The examples which have been mentioned are opinion broadcasters, weather, news and sports. It is the policy of the CBC, as I understand it, that these are

not available for commercial sponsorship. I am only say if they were, there is a firm demand for them, and if it is more revenue that is required, it can be made by the sale of this type of programme as they are now given and as they are now listened to.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Are you saying sports broadcasts are not open to sponsorship? It seems to me I have seen several sports events that have been carried ---

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, that is quite true. But I think it is a sports commentary.

THE CHAIRMAN: Analagous to the news perhaps?

MR. WRIGHT: It is sports news I am given to understand now. I think all the statements that I have been making, the statements I have been making on behalf of those for whom I appear, all depend on a more commercial viewpoint and understanding of the aim of advertising, and its importance on the whole Canadian scene. The thing is simple. The advertiser is buying something that is worth something to him in selling his goods or services, and if it is worth it there are very few limits to his buying it.

Now, I would like to suggest that this increased revenue from commercial sources could be made available under the present system. I think the first thing would be by a strong declaration in the report of this Commission on the importance of Canadian advertising to Canada and its legitimate place in Canadian broadcasting. There is no such

arrangement now anywhere, and yet here we have something that is maintaining and supplying funds for a very large part of Canadian broadcasting at the present time. This is not to speak in criticism of the other Commissions, particularly of the Massey Commission -- they were dealing with the national development of arts, letters and sciences, and they were concerned with many of the arguments that are now put before you. They were not interested primarily in the financial side of it, nor was the financial problem that faced them comparable to the one that faces you.

The second thing is by a more commercial point of view within the CBC itself with regard to programmes and activities producing commercial revenue, or, to put that in a simpler phrase, by conducting commercial business of the CBC on a commercial basis. I think one way in which that might be done is to departmentalize actual broadcasting in the CBC into periods that would be commercial and would be conducted on a purely commercial basis and other periods. But at the present time the merger of interests that are inherent in the CBC is one that certainly cuts down the revenue-producing qualities of the present organization in television.

Then, we are very strong on the licensing under national control of competitive stations in every city where channels are available, and sufficient commercial demand exists and we say the other way is providing for the non-commercial and

uneconomic features of national broadcasting by grants from public funds. One of the present difficulties is that commercial motives and points of view that I speak for and have been referring to is now being used or squeezed to the maximum but in an essentially non-economic and non-commercial way to produce as much revenue as possible, and that appeared in the evidence of the chairman of the CBC who said, and I think the general manager, he said they tried to get as they could get out of commercial people, but on the basis of the type of policy and shows that they had determined upon.

Now, why should this type of thing be done? I suggest that it will develop the strongest possible national television system with maximum income and resources. Several occasions the chairman and general manager said what they needed so much today, what they wanted today was money. That was what was holding them back from a good number of things, but in so far as they attract commercial revenue they will have additional money -- not only additional money for actual production in the commercial interests, but additional money on the proper basis.

Then, the next point which I want to develop: it will provide competition, and it is the position of this Association that competition will produce better programmes, more and better talent and better broadcasting. I would like to deal with one aspect of competition, if I may, the aspect which has been argued before you, which is competitive stations in

the large centres.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have been talking now for nearly an hour and a half. Would you like a break?

MR. WRIGHT: I think after that, I should say would you like a break.

---Short recess.

(Page 2948 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we will come to order. Mr. Wright, you were just starting on competitive stations in larger centres, I think.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I want to say that, as appears in Annex "G", the advertisers and the people in advertising are united, I think, in their support of there being competitive stations in the major centres. I think it must be evident from the extracts and the places which we have set out in Annex "G" why, from their point of view, and, I think, from the general interest, that it is just inherent in the advertising business that, when you have a major market and you have advertisers who wish to sell their goods and services to that market, you should have the instruments available to do it.

Now, as I have mentioned, our point is not that the channels should be filled just to fill them, but that there should be no general policy, as there is now, against second stations, and that applications should be considered on their merits; and that, particularly, in those statements we make with regard to the cities of Canada where, in the opinion of those who instruct me, TV facilities are inadequate to the actual demand for advertising; that is, inadequate in the sense of time.

Now, some of them are Halifax, Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Regina, Calgary, Edmonton and Vancouver. Those are not all places where there is a CBC monopoly, and I think I should explain the kind of demand I am referring to. I

have no doubt that in all those places there is some time available. All I am saying from the point of view of the advertisers is that there is a demand, that it cannot be met on the present stations; it may be a demand for advertising time or for special time that is already fully taken up, and we are not saying that in those cities there is a place for a second station. That burden rests on the people who want the franchise; but we are saying that those are places where consideration, from our point of view, could be given to a second station, because to some, or to the full extent, they are used. I have said "to the full extent" because Toronto is the outstanding example. Here in an area -- a consuming area -- I suppose, of, perhaps, two million people, you probably have in the city of Toronto the largest potential unfranchised commercial TV centre on this continent; and what has happened in comparable cities, in comparable societies on this continent indicates that not only is there room for one, but where channels are available there would be room for more than one station in Toronto.

Now, Toronto is an outstanding example not only because of the commercial demand, of which there can be no doubt, but because a station in Toronto, owing to the strength of the commercial support available in a community broadcasting-wise of two million people, is such that it is from Toronto one can contemplate some forms of Canadian programming from a second station; and if it is

Canadian programming it might be on, or should be on, a basis suitable for a network. So that the station in a place like Toronto has an added factor of vital importance. Not only is it available to serve the commercial need, but it can, and should, be made available to serve the national need in some way.

This represents difficulties, but in our opinion they are not insuperable difficulties.

Now, one of the major features -- perhaps I would be excused for taking Toronto, and I merely take it as an example as the outstanding place where the commercial broadcasting service could be added. Toronto is now the first English-speaking production centre of the CBC, but there is only one producer in Toronto. It certainly is the view of the Association of Canadian Advertisers that if you had a competitive producer operating in the city of Toronto it would do more for the quality and finances of the programme production part of the national system than almost anything else; that the competitive factor is just what is needed, and would operate here -- as, no doubt, it could operate in other centres -- but here it could operate directly on the programmes, and we would get away from the monopoly situation that now exists in the great producing centres.

THE CHAIRMAN: You say it would produce better programmes. What do you mean by "better programmes"?

MR. WRIGHT: Programmes that would appeal more widely to the public -- (a) CBC programmes

that would appeal more widely and (b) better programmes by somebody's standard.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think this is a point on which it is worth pressing you to be precise. You mean "better" in getting a bigger audience? That is certainly one test which you might apply. Do you mean "better" on some abstract level of taste, or quality, or educational value?

MR. WRIGHT: No, I mean better by almost all the things that one can judge or measure.

Let us take electrical forms of hairdressing or any other physical thing that is going on. Those shows are better, illustrated by the experience of the members of this Association -- it is competition that brings improvements in those kinds of things. At the present time there isn't competition, and we just leave things exactly as they are; but bringing in a competitive factor, in which there are people who are trying to do the same job, but in competition, would produce better results of whatever kind. The monopoly in this particular position doesn't produce the best.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wright, I yield to no one in my admiration of competition as effective in improving normal development of the trade in goods. I am merely raising for your comment the question of whether the general statement that competition improves the quality -- by whatever standard you choose, and you are prepared to take almost any standards -- that this rule or yardstick necessarily

operates in the field of communications?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: "Quality" is a term that has different connotations to everybody in this room, and to get on to a discussion of quality, I think, would be just wasting time.

THE CHAIRMAN: It may be, Mr. Stewart, but in this sphere we have had so many times the phrase "applying the virtues of competition to this channel of communication", and I think that case needs to be articulated. Let us take something like comics. I am not sure that you can necessarily say that competition in horror comics will necessarily produce better comics. It may, of course, produce more sensational comics.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes; but I think that is a criminal offence. I think competition in stealing produces better stealing.

THE CHAIRMAN: But there are some comic books which are not criminal offences.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes; but you are citing a field which has something of a universal application. I am not arguing it is something of universal application. I am saying, though, that in this particular context, and from the knowledge of the people who instruct me, they feel it would produce better programmes, and I would like to suggest -- and I have suggested -- some of the reasons. Then I would like to come back to the question of quality, if I could. Perhaps if I can make these points then I will come back to it.

Now, the CBC is the only programme-producer in Canada for large audiences except when it buys or admits programmes from the United States. Now, if there were a private station it would provide a number of things that go to provide better programmes -- and I think on some of these you would find that the CBC is very much in agreement. The first one is more studios and facilities. One of the greatest strangulations that is going on in Canadian television at the present time is the shortage of studios, and, undoubtedly, any private station that was starting in a city such as Toronto would be required to provide a studio which would be an increasing factor -- a beneficial factor -- in the national picture, or could be made so, because it is studios that are needed. In the article in Maclean's which has been quoted so often the two leading Canadian comedians, Wayne and Shuster, say that the greatest single potential in their work would be a television studio with a live audience. That is, it is awfully hard to be funny to a camera! These facilities are things that could reasonably be expected to come from any development of private stations in a centre such as Toronto; and a serious addition to the studio facilities would be made available for the national need and the national network -- which is another matter -- and would be a great step forward.

Secondly, I have referred to greater audiences. I think it would -- when I say "I think", the Association thinks -- it would increase the

acceptance and viewing of Canadian shows in a centre like Toronto, so that you would have an increasing number of people as Canadian television fans instead of the seven thousand signers who say they are American television fans and won't look at the CBC. Perhaps some of those hardy creatures could be broken down if they had here a second and competitive station so that there was a choice.

Now, in the field of talent which, I contend, would produce better shows if there were here an active station which had some responsibility for putting on live Canadian shows, I think it goes without saying that out of a city of two million people there would be more people available in the television talent field than under the present monopoly. In a community such as this, any two million people can produce talent, and the people of that type who go to make up the people in this area can produce a very remarkable amount of talent. This is probably now, with new immigration and the smartening up of some of the older inhabitants, as rich an area in talent as you can get. When you look at the diversity of talent and the richness and experience and background of the people who have recently come to the area -- I won't say of all the people -- there is something more than can be brought out by simply one station and by non-competitive methods. So I submit that it would increase talent. I am always assuming that the station in Toronto would be required to do something in the national interest, that it wouldn't

simply be an airborne film show; and I think that is inherent in our national picture and also in the fact that as matters now stand a station in Toronto -- even with two of them -- would be in a monopoly position.

THE CHAIRMAN: This may be as good a time as any to expand on that. Do I take it from what you say that your recommendation of a second station in, say, Toronto, would involve fairly precise requirements on that station as to programme content, nature of programmes -- in other words, regulation?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. Our position is that we are not arguing that point. We are not asking for an all-commercial station, because we say we are under the same umbrella as everybody else; and we say that in the sense that that is the matter which is before you. That is the basis it is on; and how this is to be straightened out is something that we do not feel we should be making any recommendations on in detail.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you are not arguing, as it has been argued by some people who have contended for a second alternative service that the second station should be completely free of regulations and completely outside the national system? You say that it should be within the national system?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes; and we say that not because, I would say, of unanimous conviction among our members, but because this is the issue, as we see it, in Canadian broadcasting, and that the possibilities are of having a complete island of an American

nature opening in Toronto and maintaining its station from United States sources.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Of course, there has been a large body of opinion that has come before us giving evidence that competition has not done anything at all to assist in elevating or getting better radio; that those competitive stations, to a large extent, have used films or American networks.

MR. WRIGHT: In radio?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes; there is now quite a competition going on in the use of records in radio, but that has been rather forced on people.

If I might just deal with what I would like to submit is wrong about the present system, under the present system the CBC has been given these full regulatory powers that have been so debated before you, and the evidence about that is that they aren't really used in the way that so many people would like to see them used, but they are given to the CBC to do a job. Now, what is happening in television is that the CBC is doing its job not through its regulatory powers but through its monopoly position in the large markets, and our submission is that the CBC should not have both, and that the one which it should have is the regulatory powers. It has a special responsibility that ought to be faced up to by regulation -- by discipline, if necessary, so that people can see on the face of it what it is that the CBC is preventing, or is against.

Now, in view of the way it works out -- and I am not criticizing them because it is a very excellent way in many senses, and it provides a very substantial amount of money -- they use their monopoly powers in the large centres to achieve some of the same results. Now, there is a tremendous case to be made for the fact that they should not have the monopoly powers in the large centres, but that the interests which you have been referring to, Mr. Stewart, should be controlled to the extent necessary by regulation. I say to the extent necessary because if we are going to have any national broadcasting system that has in it elements that are dependent on trade and commerce, or on commercial principles, then you can only go as far as the basis merits. That is to say, for instance, that to give a private franchise to the city of Toronto and to say that you have to give sustained programmes, or programmes of a non-commercial character for all but three hours of the day, is not a realistic approach. There is some point in there where it would be a realistic approach, and the CBC are perfectly conscious of that, and, indeed, as the evidence is before us now, they have worked it out with regard to the existing private stations, trying to get an economic basis on which they can operate. But that can be done very readily in the city of Toronto, and, at the same time, measures, either by regulation or otherwise, can be made that will add directly to the strength of the national system, although I was dealing rather more with the indirect advantage of

advertising with respect to competition. There is the fact that if you are a performer on a show that is available for large audiences, or if you are a person who is supporting a show that is available for large audiences you have a choice. Now you have no choice. If you are a performer in Canada you have the choice in television of working for the CBC or going to the United States; and certain of our talent goes to the United States. I think, broadly speaking, when people see particularly good people on television they wonder how much longer they are going to be available here. We have competition experience in that sense, but it is competition of no value to the country.

Now, if you had a private station strong enough in Toronto to produce its own live show then you would have competition operating with respect to the talent. You have some place else where they could make their living.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wouldn't that necessarily raise the cost of the talent for both?

MR. WRIGHT: Perhaps it would; but it would raise it to what it is worth. How can we keep them in this country if we have to pay people on the cheap for something that is of worth? You can't build a system paying on the cheap. Now, at the present time that principle may not be operating at either end of the scale, but with competition it has a chance to operate.

Another field in which competition would be

of tremendous help would be in the field of producers; and this is a place where the CBC has developed a good number of producers, and is developing more, but there is no other field for them in Canada except in the range of the CBC. The producer has become a very important part of our television shows. Now, producers, in fact, don't merit support equally; some are better than others and some are more experienced than others. Some do a better job than others.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are other opportunities for producers. The CBC stations and all the 25 private stations must have producers, necessarily.

MR. WRIGHT: I think it would be most interesting if you could have them produced before you.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have seen some of them.

MR. WRIGHT: But they don't produce the type of show that is now being produced for network production -- or a good number of them don't. Perhaps the real answer to that, I think, is that those producers are completely limited by the present organization which does not really give them the opportunity; that the only opportunity for producing shows for large audiences, broadly speaking, is in the studios of the CBC.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: In other words, you are saying that despite the fact there are 25 private stations as against 8, CBC control the network, and consequently the private stations have small, local audiences and can't employ these good producers?

MR. WRIGHT: That is right. They can get

started with private stations.

The point I am trying to make is that they don't really turn out as well as they might, under a monopoly system.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us suppose you had got these private stations in a number of centres. There would, therefore, be a number of other private stations -- that is, second stations -- you would have a number of stations where they would all have a batch of producers -- let us stick to the producers. Well, now, if you had a second station in Toronto, you have the existing network system of CBC with its existing private stations. How would these producers for the new Toronto station get into the network game, so to speak?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, I think, in one way. I myself can't see why, if you are producing shows -- live Canadian shows -- in Canadian interests in Toronto for Toronto audiences -- I can't see why, in general, such shows should not be inseparable from the network. That is one of our submissions.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am only trying to get at the thought here. Doesn't that get you into a very difficult competitive position within your constituency and the advertisers? Supposing this new station produced a good network type of show for the "X" tobacco company -- on the second Toronto station -- and supposing the CBC network is carrying a network show for the "Y" tobacco company, there is only so much time on the national network, and,

therefore, if the show of the "X" tobacco company on the private station was better than the show for the "Y" tobacco company on the network stations, is it your contention, then, that the "Y" show should be struck off and the "X" show taken on?

MR. WRIGHT: With respect, I don't think that is the problem of the CBC, or would be for some time. The problem is to have competition and get enough live talent shows for the network. They are now carrying a good deal of films. They are carrying films because of the fact that they haven't enough production. Well, the problem, while it arises -- it does arise -- isn't the basic problem. That can be arranged under present conditions very readily. It is true in the situation you mentioned it wouldn't go out over the network at that time. I am quite ready to pursue that, but I consider that if there were private stations, under the conditions you have outlined, this is one of the problems of the CBC -- if it is producing good shows how to get those shows out to the people of Canada; if it isn't producing good shows then they can forget about it. But I don't believe if you had private stations here producing any live Canadian shows in this city, and spending considerable sums of money on them to attract the audience in this area, that you wouldn't have something which would be attractive generally and would be Canadian.

May I just qualify it this way? When I speak of shows and when people speak of shows, I think one thinks, of course, of sparkling entertainment.

Now, as we have set forth in the brief, and as happens even under present conditions in Canada, a show once a week for fifty-two weeks, of the type that we have been discussing, involves an expenditure, perhaps, of half a million dollars -- perhaps more. So when we are speaking of shows and when referring to the great virtues of competitive stations, the competition may only produce three additional good Canadian shows, because at the rate of half a million dollars a year or more, that may be more than can be afforded; but if it can produce one good Canadian show then it has gone a long way along solving the problem.

-
(Page 2963 follows)

Now the other way in which a competitive station in a centre such as Toronto could be of maximum help is this way, we are, in television broadcasting in a medium that has on the market all sorts of new ideas, new approaches in every part of it are being developed and at the present time the only way they can be developed in Canada is in the CBC and they are affected therefore by all the complications of the CBC, too little money, a monopoly position, and in some places a monopoly outlook. One of the greatest contributions to a large self-sufficient station in a link such as Toronto would be Canadian contribution to television advance. Let us suppose that some new -- well, we don't have to suppose -- the better equipment is now being sold than was originally purchased by the CBC, after operation let us assume it purchases better television, let us assume the private station buys it and produces it in Toronto, then you will have that improvement going into the CBC. It will have to go in through competition whereas under present conditions that does not obtain, and I suggest, if the present equipment could hold together it could operate indefinitely while the rest of the world courses on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us illustrate that in two ways. Take the existing television system where you have eight CBC stations and 25 private stations. We have seen a number of them. We have been told by the private television operators

that their equipment in those private stations is less adequate under the existing system right now than the CBC equipped studios are. Take the example where the CBC produces with three cameras and the private stations say they can only afford one. Now the resulting show is necessarily better if you have three alternative cameras, it will be better than if you have only one camera. You have got the trial run, in a sense, in the existing system and the productions of the private station similar to the one you are advocating are not in fact able to justify this greater type of competition.

Let me put the second one and you can answer both at once. You have two very similar media in television and radio. We have in fact had over twenty years in this country of experience with radio and with private stations perfectly free to do what you are now suggesting for television stations, to develop programmes of their own which would be good enough to get on the network, and once or twice they were taken on the network, but the evidence we have had from a great many sources has been that the private stations have not done very much in this type of network worthy programmes in radio. Why do you think that precisely the same set-up in television would produce something so much better?

MR. WRIGHT: May I answer the second question first? I think the real reason -- there are two reasons -- first is the tremendous demand

on television, the tremendous challenge of television. You can get away with second rate programmes in radio but you cannot get away with second rate programmes in television. You have to have first rate programmes, you have to have some. You cannot have a programme schedule without depending on film that is going to be exciting from seven o'clock in the morning until one o'clock in the morning, but if you do produce you have to produce a first class show which is very demanding. The second is, I think that in that field anyone producing in this kind of market would be required to do more than the private radio stations are required to do. I think it goes without saying that with the one monopoly channel ll you will have a tremendous competing going on by people and that competing could be expressed in terms of advantage to the national system and type of Canadian production to which I have been referring. You see, one simple way in which that could be done is in our relation to network, that if an advertising show was to be admitted to the network it had to put on Canadian live talent shows, coming up with certain qualifications, and that would lead to the advertisers supporting that kind of show in the private station.

Now, with regard to the first one, about the private station equipment, it is not the privacy of the private station that leads to less equipment, it is the fact that they are in small markets and cannot afford, and nobody could afford, very much more than they have. I don't know enough about

their finances to make that statement categorically but as against a station operating in the city of Toronto and a private station there would be no comparison on a private television operating in the city of Toronto or a smaller centre. I imagine Vancouver or Montreal offer the same opportunity. The station is faced with a tremendous challenge, it simply could not and would not be going on the air as sort of a racket. It is, when you talk about a contribution to this community by one station, that is a tremendous contribution and has to be made, a large capital expense has to be made and the best in equipment. That is the reason I am using Toronto because a Toronto station would be a contributor and would be different perforce because of the job it has to do and the resources it has available to do it, different from any other or from most other stations in centres in Canada.

There is, I submit, a tremendous opportunity here to get a new element, a strong element, into our national broadcasting from a second station in Toronto.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just following on from that, you have mentioned the notion of regulation being implicit in the establishment of a second television outlet in a place like Toronto. We were told, we will have to check it, that there are some pretty powerful economic factors at work here in connection with the thing you mention earlier in your submission concerning the proximity to the United States and the influences of the availability of American programmes.

The way it was put to us was that a medium sort of variety show costs about \$30,000 to produce in the United States. Many of them cost much more. We in Canada produce something roughly comparable for ten or fifteen thousand dollars but a private station can rent the Canadian rights for the American show for maybe \$2,000. Now with that force of economics on a private commercial outlet, would your regulation extend to limiting the amount of such \$2,000 deals they could make?

MR. WRIGHT: I see no reason why it should not extend to that, if that is concluded by the regulating body to be in the public interest. I am not arguing for unrestricted programme freedom, I suspect that the price that any regulating body has to arrive at is a fairly -- is one that in the long run is fairly favourable to film, simply because if you are going to use facilities in Toronto from seven in the morning until one in the morning you cannot get Canadian sources of programmes. Now I think the effect of competition in producing programmes -- it is difficult to appreciate it in an atmosphere where it is said it costs so much to do something. It seems to me the effect of competition with regard to programmes is to get some lively producer or responsible person and say, now we have to do a show and we have only so much to spend on it, now you get on with it. It is that type of competition that can produce better programmes and that type of approach is possible. I have no doubt/^{it} is done in

the CBC, but the position, a monopoly position, does not really maintain it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why would any advertiser spend ten or fifteen thousand dollars for a Canadian produced programme when he could get a fair fac simile by importing from the United States for \$2,000?

MR. WRIGHT: I think he would because of the impact of regulations. Now it is the impact of monopoly. I say it should be the impact of regulations. There is all sorts of room for argument about regulation. Was it a good regulation, were both sides heard, all the rest of it. That is the price we pay for regulation, that is what we ought to pay. What we are getting is the effect but through the exercise of monopoly -- no reason for it. Let us get real things operating. If you have a private station, let us say in Toronto, if you had a regulation that was going to be brought in that every station in the Toronto area had to carry, let us say, an hour and a half or two hours of live Canadian programmes every night, then I assume if that could not be done or if there were reasons against it, they could be produced to the regulating body and they could decide if it is a practicable regulation or not. For my part, and I think it is fair to say from the advertisers' part, that problem is the station's problem. We are saying from our point of view if there were a private station -- if there were a private station operating that we think it would be very much in our interest and in the interest of better

broadcasting to have it because of the effect of all the competitive elements. As it is now there are practically no competitive elements in dealing with network broadcasting.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, of course there are limits, physical limits, as to the amount of competition you can actually introduce. I can see your argument very clearly if you had unlimited channels available. In Toronto there is only one more channel technically at the moment. Practically there may be some more later on with the ultra high frequency but when you have added your second station you are still going to have a situation with considerable elements of monopoly in it; are you not?

MR. WRIGHT: That is perfectly true. You will have a situation not unlike the situation in the United States as far as advertisers are concerned, although you have a situation that has been suggested in the United States as monopolistic from the advertisers' point of view, you do have that choice. It makes an important difference between network control and network control in Canada because network control in the States is on a competitive basis and network control here is on a monopolistic basis.

THE CHAIRMAN: I must say you are arguing the virtues of competition in order to have the odd case of a second station and the Americans at the moment are up to their eyes in controversy on the question of the furious monopoly that exists where they have at least two and a half networks operating.

MR. WRIGHT: I would like to pass on to another subject.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well, sir.

MR. WRIGHT: I have a number of other subjects but I shan't labour them. I would like to mention the difference between radio and television in serving Canadian needs. I am sure this has been made before you, but I am particularly conscious of it because of some features of my background and the point is simply this, that radio is particularly well equipped to serve what is generally known as the cultural group or cultural audience, and particularly well equipped to serve the minority audience. So when we look at broadcasting from the point of view of a national service and a great deal of service to the groups that the Massey Report was arguing for can be given and is being given by radio, and with regard to much of it better given by radio than by television. Music is a first class example. The difficulty for a sophisticated audience with regard to television is not only does the speech have to be good but the sight has to be good. I take the example of a play about Rome. If you listen to a play about Rome on the radio the Rome you see is the Rome you have in your head, and it is perfectly satisfactory to you. If you see a play about Rome on television then if there is a light standard from Toronto or Montreal or a policeman dressed the wrong way or some other thing the show is a failure for the sophisticated person because it

is not satisfying. That is what I say about it being so demanding. We are now serving in the National Radio networks in the terms of the Massey Report and serving satisfactorily a great many of minority groups, so-called minority groups. I would like to take the example of the stamp collectors. The stamp collectors club is around noon on Saturday. It is not as satisfactory to some collectors, I have no doubt, as having the actual stamp held up and the people peering at them through magnifying glasses, but it is a very reasonable way of serving a minority audience. It is getting to the source in an atmosphere that recognizes the extreme cost of television to serve that particular minority on television, except as a spectacular wider interest; it is just uneconomical, and that is the point I want to make there.

This was foreseen, as you know, by the Massey Report, or in the Massey Report. They recognized at page 304 that it has been suggested that television may eventually supersede radio. If this should happen most of what we have said would apply to television. All I am trying to say is to repeat that so much of what was said in the Massey Report in regard to broadcasting is being satisfied to a large degree by the National Radio Service now.

There are three other points I would like to refer to. I would like to pick up a remark that was put to you with regard to culture and

point out that the point of view of the advertisers is when we speak of Canadian culture we are speaking of a much wider term than is found on most of the pages of the Massey Report. The lumberjack and the hockey player and the train conductor and the private soldier and all these people in so far as they are Canadians are part of Canadian culture, and one way towards a distinctive Canadian culture that is being sought is by development of these people, such as by the presentation to them of cultures in other lines or fields.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are accepting the broader definition of culture given by the group from the University of British Columbia?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, if it is the same as what I have said I am accepting it. Now I will venture to quote something said before the Massey Commission which illustrated this aspect of Canadian culture in a very graphic way. The radio station at Flin Flon, CFAR, had sent down a brief with regard to the programmes of the CBC as containing, I forget the words, cultural trash or cultural bilge -- some descriptive term of this kind -- and the owner of the station, Mr. Whitney, came to Winnipeg and as he sat there the Commission started to ask him about this. I would like to quote to you:

"Dr. Neatby: You haven't found yourselves embarrassed by having to carry excessively cultural programmes?"

"Mr. Whitney: We haven't had to carry them, but we did find ourselves embarrassed by them because the community found it just a little too much.

"Dr. Neatby: But they can take the Wednesday Night? That interested me very much.

"Mr. Whitney: Yes. I think one of the reasons is that the Wednesday Night's series is acknowledged as an experiment and the people are willing to go along with it. They don't feel it is being thrown at them. In other words, they are being asked to partake of something."

I found this one of the most illuminating things because Flin Flon, for all its virtues, is not one of the cultural centres of Canada. Here your man from Flin Flon was giving the point of view of the kind of Canadian that is more Canadian than anybody else, the miner, the worker, the householder, the trainman, the men that make up the great majority of our population, and this is the basis on which that man is speaking through Mr. Whitney. He was prepared to go along with that cultural programme and I suggest and suspect that type of programme gets a great deal more response than the most beautiful rendition of classical music by an acknowledged master. It is something the Canadian people can

be made to feel they have a part in. I think we hope there can be more and more of that. I wanted to repeat that to the Commission. I think there is quite a tremendous amount of light on the culture issue raised.

(Page 2975 follows)

Now, I would like to say something very briefly about French-speaking Canadians. When I took on this responsibility I was sure there would be all sorts of special problems involving advertisers so far as the French-speaking Canadians were concerned, and I certainly went at it on the basis that would be so, and I asked permission of having a presentation made to the Commission so that we could present it.

I have gone into this on six occasions now with groups in Montreal, and I am assured by them that so far as advertisers are concerned there is no special French-speaking problem. There is no special problem in French-language advertising. Their main problem is a particular example of the whole Canadian problem, and we have set this out in the brief that you have with regard to French networks, and with regard to the French people, exactly the same type of problem that the Canadian people and Canadian networks have with regard to American people. You have it operating in a similar way, but you see it in a most graphic way. It costs much more to broadcast and advertise in terms of reception in the province of Quebec, and yet from the point of view of the French-speaking people it is an essential feature of their life.

Now, the advertisers' point of view is the same as the broadcasters'. We are anxious, in our case, for purely commercial reasons, to do the same job as the broadcaster; that is, serve the French-speaking Canadian in his own town, but

economically that is even more difficult than it is in other parts of Canada, and therefore one of the decisions of the advertiser is that we support special financial public support for French-speaking broadcasts in Canada. We have to do it, and we recognize that the public has to do it if that distinctive quality of our country is to be preserved, and we accept that in the same way as we accept other matters which we suggest.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Are you advocating special grants from the Government for the support of the French network?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, we are advocating it, with respect, that it is essential. It is not something which can be put on a straight commercial basis, but there is great support from advertisers to the extent of that market.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You mean radio and television?

MR. WRIGHT: I am sorry. I cannot at the moment speak on radio.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Only television?

MR. WRIGHT: Only television. I would have to consult about radio. I want to say just one thing, and to put in as an exhibit -- because I understand it has not been put in -- I want to put in a piece of video tape as a sort of symbol that things were moving in the broadcasting field. This is the video tape that you have heard so much of, and I was fortunate enough to have some of it.

I thought I would produce it to the Commission.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think we need to mark this, Mr. Wright. I do not think it would make much sound if we did.

MR. WRIGHT: I do emphasize video tape and colour as important factors. I do emphasize also as important factors in the future new techniques for television.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: As I understand it your video tape may reduce expenses while colour adds expenses?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. I was not dealing with expenses. I think that is so, but I was not dealing with expenses as much as the future of the whole thing. I am trying to emphasize there can be all sorts of developments and will be all sorts of developments in the television and one of the items which will help towards that is by having as many competitive elements as we can have consonant with our national policy, and I think that is one of the strongest reasons for getting as strong competitive elements as possible in broadcasting advertising.

We have certain competitive elements now, and they are not really competitive elements as you have pointed out in view of the geographical distribution of them. With this developing in the way it is, we can develop thrilling things in Canada, and we ought to, but one of the things we ought to enlist is the competition of Canadians in trying to do them.

Now, I think the position of the advertisers is clear. Canadian business is ready to pay for television just what television is worth in business terms. We do not go any further. I have dealt with other matters. This is \$40 million today, and can be very much more if attention is paid to the business factors involved. This use of TV can provide Canadian service wherever viewer interest is broad and deep enough to merit it.

There are four major points we wish to make:

Trade and commerce and advertising is an important feature of national life worthy of the direct service of the National Broadcasting system.

Commercial revenue can support whatever TV broadcasting is justified by commercial return and will not be available if it is not commercially sound.

Non-commercial features of our broadcasting system cannot be paid for on a cost basis by commercial revenue.

There are certain national broadcasting costs which must be met out of public revenue.

We specifically ask that your report should recognize: a place in our broadcasting policy of Canadian trade and commerce and its advertisement;

A dependence of commercial revenue on commercial principles;

The need for a new commercial outlook and sound commercial procedures within the CBC;

The need for competition and competitive

stations in TV;

And the need for special support of French-language television.

I am sorry to have taken so long.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not at all, Mr. Wright. It has been very interesting, and I think both our counsel are going to at one time or another take a crack at you. Who is going to start?

MR. COYNE: I was going to start, Mr. Chairman. I will do so now if you wish.

THE CHAIRMAN: Please.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Wright, I would like to refer to your main brief very largely in developing these questions. At the outset, very briefly, what you called your main brief, that is your first or introductory five pages, and I would direct your attention to page 2, paragraph 5. You say:

"Canadian television broadcasting can only proceed on the scale required by the Canadian public . . . if advertising is recognized as a necessary and integral part. The reasons for this submission are briefly that the cost of television broadcasting in Canada is necessarily so heavy that every available and significant source of lawful income must be integrated into the system. . ."

I take it you are stating this as a basic premise, but do you mean in effect that it would not be politically

acceptable in the broadest sense to provide sufficient funds to operate a satisfactory national TV system without commercial revenue? It would theoretically be possible to do so.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, I suppose ---

MR. COYNE: In other words, why do you say we have to ---

MR. WRIGHT: That is theoretical, or it is a political item. Yes, I think we are proceeding on the assumption there is not one hundred million dollars available out of national revenue for television at the present time, and that that pretty well describes the scale the Canadian public want it at as viewers, and not as taxpayers, and that is only the start. We have made the point that expenditures of that kind are out of proportion with the other expenditures that are now being made by the national Government for other needs.

MR. COYNE: You are saying in effect it is really practically impossible to develop a satisfactory TV system without utilizing commercial funds and support?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Then, just turning on the same page to your paragraph 8, and I am not sure you have not dealt with this in your presentation, you say:

"If Canadian network television broadcasting were permitted to develop on purely commercial principles it could be argued that Canadian television

programmes in the English language

would be largely non-Canadian in origin."

Do you accept this argument that the pressures towards the imported American films will be overwhelming if purely commercial principles applied, or does it answer my question where you said as far as you are concerned it would be appropriate for regulation to be applied to govern these things?

MR. WRIGHT: I think the first answer you have given to my question is the right one. We accept this as the present position; namely that all commercial -- an all-commercial system is not acceptable -- and I am specifically not in a position to say that the members of this Association necessarily accept that if there were an all-commercial system it would be non-Canadian. We put it exactly as we put it. It could be argued, and we recognize that commercial principles cannot be applied exclusively because of our Canadian point of view.

MR. COYNE: You did say in answer to the question from the Chairman earlier that you saw no objection to regulations respecting programme content that might counteract this pressure from the United States. Is that correct?

MR. WRIGHT: No, I do not think -- I am a great fellow for seeing objections.

MR. COYNE: Well, please object.

MR. WRIGHT: No, I do not think I said I saw no objection, but I said that was the answer to the particular problem that he was posing to me.

There are objections to it, and quite serious objections, but that is the way in our national broadcasting setup that we have sought to provide against that type of thing and not by monopoly.

MR. COYNE: You are not recommending any other method of meeting this problem?

THE CHAIRMAN: Except by the method of regulation.

MR. COYNE: You said that this was the method that fitted in with our system but that there were objections to it, but you are not suggesting any alternate method?

MR. WRIGHT: No. Are you asking about the independent regulatory body?

THE CHAIRMAN: No. We are asking merely about the existence of regulation as being a method whereby this ---

MR. WRIGHT: We are not advocating it. We say it is there. That is what it is there for.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you leave that paragraph, you did say to Mr. Coyne, this paragraph in effect says an all-commercial system is not acceptable. Is it not a fair summary of your whole brief to say you are suggesting a more commercial system than exists today?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And that it would be acceptable?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, that is right.

MR. COYNE: I do not know what ideas you

may have as to timing. I was going on into some more general matters.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we will have to ask Mr. Wright and his associates to come back this afternoon. We may even have to ask you to come back later on because there are many points on which your advice could be helpful to us. We can take a look at the programme for this afternoon and see whether any adjustments might be made in it to give more time now, but if not, would it be possible for you to come back some other time?

MR. WRIGHT: Oh, yes, we would be entirely able to meet your convenience at any time.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would say go ahead for another ten minutes and then adjourn until two-thirty and go on then for a time.

MR. COYNE: All right. Then, Mr. Wright, I would like to turn to your Annex "B", where you deal with Canadian broadcasting in the light of its background. Starting with paragraph 8 on page 10 you describe in some detail the recommendations of the Massey Report, and I think you said in the course of your presentation that by and large the tone of that report was anti-commercial in a very general sense.

Then in paragraph 17 on page 12 you read into this a distinction between radio and television, and if I do not misinterpret you, you say there in effect, although provision of programmes to meet minority tastes may be possible in radio, but the

costs on television are so great that TV must inevitably reach out for the largest audiences which will attract the advertisers' dollars. Is that a fair summation of the point you are making there?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, the first part is true. I would say that what we are advocating is the larger audience. We are saying TV cannot afford the smaller audience.

MR. COYNE: Are you saying that the type of balanced programme, including programmes of a cultural nature if you like, for minority audiences which the CBC has developed in radio, is not practically possible in TV?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, and that the balance actually is to be worked out, ought to be made for those groups, bearing in mind both broadcastings. It surely must happen now in the house of an orchestra -- classical orchestra conductor -- that he listens to the radio a very great deal of time. When there is a television broadcast that is of interest to him, then he cannot listen to both, and the programming ought to bear in mind that most of his tastes can be served by the radio.

MR. COYNE: Doesn't this mean that the use of TV as a cultural and educational medium, about which we have heard quite a lot in the last few weeks, is pretty well severely limited?

MR. WRIGHT: It is only limited by the amount of money made available for it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Aren't you saying it is

limited by the amount of money?

MR. WRIGHT: As I understand it, it is you gentlemen in the first instance who have to say how much money is to be made available.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are looking at your contention here, and certainly it seems to me to come down to your contention that you are saying that because of costs television in Canada has to be more commercial, to use that phrase, than radio. The way you have put it, most of the freight has to be paid in television and therefore most of the time has to be taken up by programmes of a kind that will commend commercial sponsorship, and what do you leave then as your television function?

Are we not by that method losing the influence of this powerful medium in other fields that have been represented to us as being valuable?

MR. WRIGHT: These are all questions of degree. I do not feel that myself. I feel in the first place that if --we can only have as much as we can afford, but I think we are inclined to under-estimate the value of purely Canadian production in our country. Now, we can only afford so much of it, but we will have it and we can have it, we think, on a commercial basis.

I think it is freely illustrated by the type of show you now get which I think some of the Commissioners have seen the preparation of. It is not only employing a hundred Canadians, but it is making a hundred Canadians very, very skilled and

adept in that particular type of thing, which is a feature of our modern life. I do not see any reason why that, to the extent that commercial money is available, that the spur of competition cannot be.

Now, with regard to the other, what I have been dealing with here is the statement in the Massey Report and that nationalism was not enough. I referred to this in the note -- it is the Massey Report at pages 280 to 281, I think.

"But national unity and knowledge of our country are not the only ends to be served . . ."

And I take it it is other ends you are now referring to.

"These important purposes are also a means to that 'peaceful sharing of the things we cherish', in St. Augustine's phrase cited at the beginning of this volume. We are thus further concerned with radio broadcasting in that it can open to all Canadians new sources of delight in art, letters, music and the drama."

My point with regard to that is a very simple one. It is not possible, nor is it desirable, to open to Canadians new sources of delight in arts, letters, music and the drama from seven o'clock in the morning until one o'clock in the morning. That is not the kind of experience that is being referred to, and if we had even one programme in Canada that was an outstanding programme, that was open to all Canadians, the new horizons that the Massey Report refers to, that would be a tremendous achievement in our national television. That would be 52 new openings a year, which would be an extraordinary thing, but a well

worth while thing, and I think that almost everyone who looks at this, almost everyone who looks at it, feels that on that side of it what we want are fewer and better programmes. Strangely enough, where we are now getting these programmes is from the United States, and we are getting -- you have been pressing me with the features in Canadian radio -- that I go back and I say isn't there a very substantial difference between the development of American radio and American television, and isn't one of the very remarkable contributions of television on this continent, and perhaps generally now, the spectacular kind of thing which was represented perhaps by Ed Murrow's show on Africa, or has been represented by a good number of other comparable things. And there was one I believe last night, although I did not have the privilege of seeing it, one about Canada, the development of the St. Lawrence seaway. Those things -- you don't need those every hour of the telecast day. If you have one of those in the evening even three days a week, but certainly seven days a week, what a tremendous service you are doing, and isn't it far better to spend our money there at this stage and to serve the interest for which I am now appearing during some of the hours of the day and to get this thing built up as much as we can in Canada?

That is one reason we say let's go on on that basis, and then in three to five years have a look at it and let's see if these ominous forebodings are true or false. But that is where the creative part of this thing can be served, not by service comparable to the classical record service that we now get on radio, but by really thrilling programmes that will give Canadian television the same name that Canadian activities in

other lines have because of special achievement.

MR. COYNE: Can't it only be served in terms of this type of spectacular programme which you mentioned which may appeal to the sixty per cent audience, and therefore attract commercial support? You pointed out that if commercial revenue is to be relied on, shows themselves must be of first quality and the programme and schedule must be strong over all.

We have heard a great deal about the inertia of a viewer or listener on the radio who has his dial tuned to a particular station, and I gather one of the tricks in attracting the tuning audience is to see he never shifts it off. But if, let us say, the CBC is forced for revenue purposes to search for that sixty per cent audience to support its commercial programme, doesn't that policy have its effect upon its other programmes?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Because it seeks and gets sixty per cent audience and then puts on some other programme that only attracts twenty per cent audience, the chances are the next succeeding programme will not attract the sixty per cent?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, it is true. It is not consonant with the people complaining that their shows come on at eleven o'clock at night so they had to make some sacrifice to see them.

MR. COYNE: Would you agree any dependence in a substantial degree on commercial revenue will

have an effect programme-wise upon the whole CBC programme?

MR. WRIGHT: It certainly should have.

MR. COYNE: And it will be based upon the manifest need to be searching for the larger audience all the time or to search for the larger audience to maintain its commercial programmes?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, that is so.

MR. COYNE: And you say there is a distinction, or would you say that this would be different in television from what it is in radio where a much smaller proportion of the revenue has to be derived from commercials?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, it is. I think it is a financial factor that makes you have to look at it from a different point of view or provide money from public funds or licence fees.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are talking about 7.00 a.m. until 1.00 a.m. That is really not in television or even in television advertising quite accurate, is it? The important hours, as I understand it, for advertising are from six or seven in the evening until closing down time, and if you introduce the commercial factor which you are speaking of everyone will be scrambling for the evening hours?

MR. WRIGHT: Those who can afford them will be scrambling for them, but if you take the city of Toronto, I do not think there is any doubt held in the minds of anyone connected with

advertising that two stations in the city of Toronto can act with suitable programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: What kind will these suitable programmes be? Will they not for the main viewing hours of the evening necessarily be almost entirely programmes of light entertainment, mass audience character?

MR. WRIGHT: Not necessarily. I quite agree with the Massey Report that that is very likely, and that perhaps is the evening hour field of television, but I do not think one can call Ed Murrow light entertainment unless one looks on the fate of the world with a curl of the lip. And that is the challenge of television, and if that type of programme applied to Canadian scenes or otherwise applied to Canadian people and attracts Canadian people, then it will get commercial support. Advertisers are not a group of people who are trying to degrade or debase public taste.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I do not think there is any such intention in anything we have seen, but it has been put to us that this television medium is a very powerful medium for tying Canada together in the best use of the word, culturally, and the broad use of the word "culturally", and does your contention not come down to the fact that these programmes which are not appealing to a large audience will not find a place in the more popular hours of entertainment?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, it does.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we can adjourn
now and resume at two-thirty.

---The Commission adjourned to resume at 2.30 p.m.

- - - - -

---On resuming at 2.30 P.M.:

SUBMISSION OF ASSOCIATION OF CANADIAN
ADVERTISERS (continued)

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you carry on now,
Mr. Coyne?

MR. WRIGHT: I wonder if I may be permitted to make one point which is not in our brief, and this is a point about what one might call a by-product of Canadian programmes? It is a view held widely among those in advertising, and as far as I know those concerned in commercial broadcasting, that one of the sources of income that can be developed from programmes presented in Canada is from their sale, either directly or on film or otherwise, in other markets of the world.

There are a great number of people in this country in the business connected with broadcasting in this country that think this can be done. So far as the best markets are concerned, it can only be done with programmes that are commercially acceptable, and I think this is another powerful reason for the encouragement of a strong, competitive interest in television in order to provide that type of programme on film or otherwise for export. It is, secondly, a very strong reason for the other thing which we asked for, which is a more commercial outlook by the C.B.C., because if those programmes are to be exported and are to attract markets, then they must have the type of appeal that the advertisers are

looking for. That is, an appeal to a substantial number of people in this country.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Wright, I wonder if you would turn to annex C?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Before you go on to that, just before the adjournment, Mr. Wright, you were talking about the need for more commercial sponsors on T.V. largely due to the excessive costs that were to be met in that field; and you brought it out also in your earlier remarks when you talked on the points in your summary. I have been looking through the Act and the various documents that we have been furnished with, and I cannot find anything in there which sets out how the C.B.C. shall function in the matter of programming.

I gather, rather, from your earlier remarks that you have no particular objection to the manner of programming in radio, in that it lends itself to certain types of programmes, but that you have a certain question in your mind as to the programmes that are being provided on the C.B.C. or on the T.V. rather. It seems to me that the C.B.C. may have carried through the programming there on the basis of the recommendation of the Massey Commission, and there might be a misinterpretation. Am I correct in thinking that the feeling of your clients is that the programming in T.V. should be fashioned more to the needs of the sponsor, but that the radio programming, as it now exists, is reasonably satisfactory?

MR. WRIGHT: No, I cannot fairly say that is the position of my clients. I am in the position, however, of dealing largely with this problem in television.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes?

MR. WRIGHT: And I have advanced the argument that -- this is one of the arguments that I cannot say has the support necessarily of the members of the Association of Canadian Advertisers -- but my argument is that this can be done in T.V. without really undermining the position taken in the Massey Report that the national broadcasting should serve minority groups.

I am not putting it forward as a proposal or something that the advertisers support necessarily, but I am saying that the change of stress that we recommend in television can be done without depriving these minority groups of the service that the Massey Report recommended they should have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Putting it another way, Mr. Wright, the Massey Report made a certain recommendation as to service which would take into account needs of minority groups and these other factors in our life, that, for want of a better term, are called non-commercial; that policy has, let us say, been applied in television reasonably well.

I take it that your main argument is that the same policy cannot be applied in television? That you must have a greater content of commercialism in television because of its high

cost and that therefore the service in the broadcasting field to the minority interests -- and by "interests" I mean interests of people in different kinds of programmes -- is going to be served in the main from radio in your contention?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, sir. I am not suggesting for a minute that television programmes should be restricted to programmes only appealing to majority audiences, but I am talking of stress, and I think stress in television ought to be on majority audiences, and therefore in the present stage, and with the present cases, rather more towards entertainment and general interest.

THE CHAIRMAN: And what you are saying, because of the cost factor we must very largely abandon these other contributions through the medium of television?

MR. WRIGHT: No, with respect, I am not saying that. I am saying all we can afford is what we have the money to do. It seems to me that the way, with respect, the way to handle that is by saying there is available in public funds this much money to be used in this type of programme, and to the extent that the money is there the programme is provided.

Now, the additional funds that could be made available for that or other types of programmes, can, I submit, be derived to a degree at least from profits in commercial business by the C.B.C.

MR. COYNE: Just carrying that a little step further, in the first place, you say -- I think

you said in answer to the Chairman's question -- that there ought to be a greater stress on the commercial aspect of T.V. Wouldn't you say there will inevitably be a greater stress on the commercial aspect because of the greater dependence of C.B.C. on revenue?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Doesn't it follow from that with regard to programmes, once you admit the C.B.C. is dependent to a large extent on commercial revenues, that even in their non-commercial programming they will not be free to put on worthwhile programmes of a non-commercial nature without having some regard to the effect that that is going to have on their audiences, and therefore on the commercial side of their business when the commercial programmes come on?

MR. WRIGHT: I think that is perfectly true if they were wholly commercial; but if they were not and they were deriving income from other commercial sources, to that extent it need not be true. Indeed it is a factor, but it needn't be a decisive or compelling factor with regard to, let us say, a programme -- I am trying to think of some appropriate type of programme to use as an example -- perhaps we can all think of our own.

MR. COYNE: You will agree that it could be a factor? I will repeat the illustration I mentioned this morning: If the C.B.C. has to aim, in order to remain financially solvent, aim for the 60% audience, then to some extent it is inhibited

with the putting on of a programme in the middle of the evening that is only going to appeal to 15%.

MR. WRIGHT: To some extent it is, but if it has money it need not be. Undoubtedly, all it does is cut down appeal of its adjoining commercial programmes, or perhaps even programmes of that particular evening.

MR. COYNE: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: But it does not represent a barrier. I have to admit it has influence, but it is not a barrier; it is not an impossible situation. It is simply one of the compromises that I think are inevitable in development of Canadian television.

MR. COYNE: Supposing we inject the question of competition into this programming problem, if you like. I suppose you could say where the C.B.C. has monopoly it is not too inhibited in its programming because there is no other Canadian station to turn to when it has a programme on for the 15% audience; but if you have a competitive station, won't that simply aggravate this programming problem that we have been speaking of because, when the C.B.C. puts on a 15% programme, the other station is going to grab the majority audience?

MR. WRIGHT: I think, Mr. Coyne, we have the situation that shows how this operates at the present time. At the present time in the City of Toronto the programme that has the largest appeal, so far as any figures that have been produced are concerned, or any private inquiries one might want

to make, the programme is the "\$64,000 Question", and I believe at the present time the C.B.C. have been programming "Citizens' Forum" against that. That is pretty sensible. As I understand it, the figures that were printed in the Telegram, with more or less authority the other day, are that 95% of the people listening or viewing in Toronto are looking at the "\$64,000 Question", and that 2% are looking at "Citizens' Forum". But that is a worthwhile show, that service is being given, and nobody is being harmed, because the advertiser that wants to get in the ring against the "\$64,000 Question" is not sitting behind me. There is a place where there is no conflict at all, and there is a real opportunity for the type of programme "Citizens' Forum" represents.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean, worthwhile programmes should be put on at the time when they won't be looked at?

MR. WRIGHT: I think this is a very good example, with respect. I think in general you will find that the viewers of the two shows are not the same people, and that both audiences are being served. I only give a general view. I have no doubt there are cross-eyed people who like to look at both, but I think it is an extremely good example of how you can slice it.

MR. COYNE: The C.B.C. having reduced itself to 2% of the audience at this time, must have considerable difficulty in then boosting this portion for any subsequent programmes?

MR. WRIGHT: That is right, and that is a factor that cannot be avoided. Of course, if the questions were being asked the other way, I would say is it your argument they ought to try to keep it down to 2% during the whole evening in order to be sure they are getting a small enough minority?

MR. COYNE: Fortunately I do not have to answer any questions. Would it be fair to put this aspect of this competition question this way in your submission: At the present moment the C.B.C. has American competition, so it is faced with competition anyway, and you are suggesting there should be Canadian competition?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, I think that is a very important element. We have estimated that out of 2 million viewers that we thought there were at the beginning of this inquiry, 900,000 were within reach of the American stations, particularly in reach of the American network programmes. We suggest private stations in general are competing. The C.B.C. is already competing with American programmes, and if something can be done to have them compete with Canadian programmes, it is very difficult for us to see how they can serve the national policy rather than harm it.

(Page 3000 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: Just arising out of this point, Mr. Wright, you are asking for greater emphasis on commercial factors in Canadian television. Your illustrations have been very much drawn from the centres in which advertising is wanted, Toronto for one, and the other larger centres. How do you say that television should be provided for the areas which don't support -- that are not good advertising fields?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, I don't like to say that is an unfair question. It is unfair in this sense: my first answer is it could not be provided from advertisers. Now, we having said that, it seems to me it is up to somebody else to say how it should be provided. There are only two sources, the communities themselves or out of the public ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Surely you are not right in saying it could not be provided from advertising?

MR. WRIGHT: I thought you were putting it to me places not economically feasible to advertise?

THE CHAIRMAN: In that area, if our purpose is to provide a national system serving all areas in Canada with television service, or reasonably all areas in Canada, theoretically you could say if you maintain the monopoly position in this field, if you wanted to follow the Aird Report in television, applied the Aird Report to everything, everything publicly-owned and operated, you could theoretically at least earn enough money in the

larger centres of population to provide the whole national system, couldn't you?

MR. WRIGHT: I am sorry, I won't answer that question, if I may. I don't know. Perhaps I could answer the question in the term given -- theoretically, yes; but where does it get us? Theoretically, yes, anything is possible theoretically, but I don't follow why it would necessarily -- why you should necessarily produce out of the larger centres and cities, the centres of population in Canada, enough money to provide, if you wish, unlimited television service.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, but you could provide limited television service for the whole of Canada if you wanted to do it out of advertising revenues.

MR. WRIGHT: Up to a point that is thought to be done; we feel it is getting fairly close to the point where it won't do it. Now, when the new licensees come in they say, "You will have to take 10½ hours of service", the C.B.C. says, "You will have to take the network at those particular rates less discount". It is the feeling of the people who instruct me this could only go a little further and you will find a falling off in the advertising support of that kind of network, which is an all-or-nothing network basically.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us assume, though, whether it is theoretical -- supposing you did have a situation of monopoly basis whereby you worked out a national programme with a reasonably wide coverage based upon commercial revenues alone; what

I want to get at: would it not necessarily mean if you opened up the areas where the advertising is heavy to other stations, that you would necessarily disturb your balance in supplying the programming to the rest of the country?

MR. WRIGHT: I am instructed, if I understand your question right, no, it would not have that effect. I know that was Mr. Dunton's testimony that it would. Certainly the advertiser's view is that it would not.

THE CHAIRMAN: You see, I think there is a problem that your clients, like all other Canadians, are concerned with, and that is the problem which is as broad as the problem of Toronto, Winnipeg, Vancouver and Halifax. It is the problem of how you get a national service out to the whole of this country. If you have any comments on that we would welcome them.

MR. WRIGHT: I think in one way, one very important way, the submission I made with regard to radio applies to that. Radio is one way which a national service, a very valuable one, can be provided throughout the country at a reasonable cost. With respect, if the problem is as it is in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon, to provide a national broadcasting service, then the way is by radio. Again you are faced with the cost. It is no more possible to bring television to some communities in Canada than to put in fresh lines of railroad. You are faced with the cost factor, no matter

how beneficial it would be. Our point is, take the centres like Fort Radium or Churchill or Moosonee.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are taking extreme cases.

MR. WRIGHT: Those are cases that could be dealt with by radio.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am putting the question to you: Is not your emphasis on greater commercialism almost necessarily forcing you to a position that television, as we will have it in the future, would, to a large extent, be reserved for those areas where the market was sufficient to carry it?

MR. WRIGHT: With respect, no, it would present to the National Government the problem of whether it was prepared to spend the money on television in those areas.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: On the other hand, the Act specifically obligates the C.B.C. to provide a national broadcasting system, a service within Canada, if you look at the interpretation of "broadcasting" you would include television. It seems to me the C.B.C. have an obligation there.

MR. WRIGHT: With respect, I think that obligation is an obligation that has to be satisfied not in both fields of radio and television.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I am not a lawyer, but it would cover television as well as radio; whether it was covered by one or the other, I don't know.

MR. WRIGHT: With respect, I don't think that is a statement by Parliament, that

every -- that substantially every Canadian or every Canadian community ought to enjoy both radio and television. Whether it is or not, it could not be done unless Parliament provides the money; the only money commerce can provide is the money I have been referring to.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't want to press you too far, but leaving out Moosonee and Fort Churchill, there must be many areas now -- and your brief, indeed, says so -- where there are television stations, smaller communities throughout the length and breadth of this country, where your advertisers apparently are not very happy to be added to that coverage now. If you move in your main programme to those kind of programmes which can be supported by advertising, and particularly if you cut into that advertising revenue by alternative stations, how do you say programmes in television are to be provided to places like Lethbridge and Moncton and other centres in Canada? Your people are not going to want to carry their programmes there, the market is not good enough. How do they get television at all?

MR. WRIGHT: First I may say, as I said in the beginning, I am appearing for a number of people that want to keep good relations with the people of Canada, and that includes the people of Lethbridge and Moncton. I don't want to get into a specific discussion of any particular Canadian town, but as far as the advertisers are concerned, with regard to, say, the fine Canadian village or town of

"Noni" -- as far as they are concerned they are only too happy to have programmes provided there. What they are not prepared to do is pay for the production. The reason is, it is not the advertiser that wants his programme in "Noni", it is two people or two bodies. One is the people of "Noni" and the other is national interest as expressed in the Broadcasting Act. Now, the person who ought to pay for putting that programme in that town -- one of the people is either the community or station who is there or the national service, not the advertiser. On the other hand, he has no objection to it going -- no objection to it going on one of two bases: either to go in with advertising attached, or to go in without advertising attached and the mere mention of his name. I think if he were pressed, not even the last. As far as the programme is concerned, it could be provided, but if there are better ways of advertising in that town, then the advertiser will want to use them in preference to spending his money in a television station. If that service is regarded as essential, it could come from public funds or from that community by their support of the television station, the programme will be available anyway.

THE CHAIRMAN: At the moment, this may not be an important question at all -- at the moment -- no, it is impractical; they could tell you to take the full network now.

MR. WRIGHT: In practice, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are saying, if the

advertiser were allowed to select his coverage for which he is going to pay, he would have no objection to the use of the programme in other places which he is not selecting.

MR. WRIGHT: That is true. I believe that is the present situation substantially in radio.

MR. COYNE: Turning to annex "D" where you are speaking of expenditures on Canadian television, there is just one question I wanted to ask you. You refer in paragraph 3 to the present rate of spending by advertisers amounting to \$40 million. You then say that it can be anticipated this rate will increase. You then give a table showing the list of expenditures in the United States from 1949 to 1954.

I would like to ask you in what year do you regard the \$40 million fitting in? It is not the equivalent of 1949; is it the equivalent of 1953?

MR. WRIGHT: It is the general view among advertisers that we are three or four years behind, subject to this: that we have at the present time at least radically different systems.

MR. COYNE: Would you then say we are about in the year 1952 in comparison with the United States?

MR. WRIGHT: 1951 or 1952. It is not a part of our case; we are merely trying to show what the elastic potential is in this matter. We are not trying to say it would be six or ten times.

We have Canadian factors that don't operate in the United States at all.

MR. COYNE: It is important in this sense; that the United States expenditures have increased by fourteen times. In that five-year period no one would seriously suggest we are faced with an increase in the next five years of fourteen times \$40 million?

MR. WRIGHT: No, we are not suggesting.

MR. COYNE: In fact, that \$40 million already includes a great deal of the equivalent increase that has taken place in the United States?

MR. WRIGHT: That is so.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: On the other hand, programmes on CBC-TV now are in some part at least not attractive to sponsors, so they are not getting the full amount out of it. Have you made any estimate of what the revenue would be if full use were made of CBC-TV to a point where it would attract advertisers? You have a figure here of \$40 million; now if full use were made of CBC-TV, what would the \$40 million amount to now?

MR. WRIGHT: No, I am sorry we haven't got that. Anyone in the broadcasting business could compute it, we would be glad to do it.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Have you any idea of the percentage of time on T.V. now sponsored as against unsponsored programmes, that is, C.B.C.?

MR. WRIGHT: No, I am sorry; I thought

that was given by C.B.C. C.B.C. will have that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you going to talk about this \$40 million figure?

MR. COYNE: I could do it if you would like me to get into that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't want too much detail, but I am mystified how this is made up. According to the second paragraph on page 15 the actual commercial revenue from television was just over \$4 million. Where does the other \$36 million go?

MR. WRIGHT: I wish that I had it available to me to answer your question. The answer to some of it can be found in other ways. How we made ours up -- how we made it up, we took the broadcast schedules for the week that we have mentioned, that is, for the two weeks' programmes of February 19th to March 3rd, and we priced every factor in connection with the programmes paid by advertisers. I used a group that, through their connections, have specific knowledge as to what payments were being made. The \$40 million did not include figures in respect of locally-produced live programmes, locally-purchased film programmes and payments made in other countries. They did present a reasonable view of the rate of minimum expenditure by advertisers. I could submit this to the Commission, but I would prefer not to do it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am trying to get the idea, not the exact detail. If you came along and said the figures shown in the C.B.C., they are

running the only television system in Canada at the moment -- if you came along and said the \$4 million by the C.B.C. is too low and ought to be \$6 million, there would be a 50% increase in other expenditures. I find it hard to understand how it goes 10 times.

MR. WRIGHT: Perhaps the best way would be if I could submit to the Commission -- not for public purposes -- the bases of our figures.

THE CHAIRMAN: So much of your brief is dependent on the \$40 million figure, it is naturally important we are reasonably satisfied it is correct.

MR. WRIGHT: We appreciate that. I would be very much surprised if you found the most intelligible people in broadcasting denied it, the way in which it is made up, and I will furnish it to the Secretary if you want.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well; you can regard that as being confidential in that sense.

MR. WRIGHT: It is based in this way: of people in the business sitting down and saying we pay this and that, and it adds up, and you are all through to \$40 million.

MR. COYNE: Just for the record, this \$40 million is not strictly comparable to the figure that appears in the C.B.C., in that statement, anyway.

MR. WRIGHT: No.

MR. COYNE: You pointed out the \$4 million figure does not include the amount paid by sponsors of agencies or amounts paid by the

C.B.C. to private stations.

MR. WRIGHT: Amounts paid directly to private stations are not included, but I think for the rest the answer is available elsewhere and should be given elsewhere.

MR. COYNE: Turning, if you will, to page 19 where you speak of the advertising cost or commercial cost of reaching the viewers in this country, you give a little table showing the total cost for 1,000 homes reached per commercial minute. You show English-speaking Canada, \$5 to \$8.50. Could you explain how that figure is calculated, briefly?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. These are figures from typical shows and subject to correction because I have not been over this recently. I believe it is made up by taking the cost of the show to the advertiser and the number of homes that are given by the Bureau of Broadcast Measurement, and how you arrive at this kind of figure now, if I could check that -- I would rather have a more authoritative statement.

MR. COYNE: I was interested in what do you mean by commercial minute? Do you mean the whole 30 minutes, or the 3 minutes of commercial announcement?

MR. WRIGHT: No, the commercial announcement.

MR. COYNE: For example, if you had 5 minutes of commercial announcement instead of 3 in a half-hour programme, your cost per commercial minute of reaching 1,000 homes would go down?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, that is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the difference between the United States and Canadian English-speaking or French-speaking based on the fact more minutes are used on United States than on Canadian?

MR. WRIGHT: No, I don't think in the type of comparable United States programme we deal with there are any more minutes used.

MR. COYNE: That would be an important factor.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes; an important factor in these types of shows we are dealing with is the actual audience or potential audience that is available.

MR. COYNE: You go on in the next paragraph on page 10 and say:

"The Canadian advertiser is put to a
"distinct disadvantage in the use of
"television as an advertising medium
"because these figures are higher in
"practically every case than comparable
"figures for other media."

What I would like to ask you is, why do you say the advertiser is put to a disadvantage if he is willing to pay \$5 for 1,000 homes per minute for television instead of \$1 that he might spend on some other medium? Surely he must be getting something which must be a more effective medium.

MR. WRIGHT: I think a great number of those who are advertising feel it is a more effective

medium, but the motives that have led a number of Canadian advertisers into television are mixed, some purely competitive. If one car maker goes into television, all car makers have to.

MR. COYNE: No particular reason why the cost of reaching 1,000 homes in a different media of advertising should be the same?

MR. WRIGHT: No, but it means that the man who is using television is apparently spending more money and paying for more expensive advertising, and is at a distinct economic disadvantage. I agree he feels he is getting some other advantage. This is a disadvantage that could roll up.

MR. COYNE: It is essential to get into this advantageous medium; is that what it amounts to?

MR. WRIGHT: That is one way of putting it.

THE CHAIRMAN: How can you have a comparable figure for other media?

MR. WRIGHT: That is why we didn't set them out. In fact, agencies and others have them but is it comparable? Do you compare a commercial minute and a page and a half of newspaper or a whole page of a magazine, or what do you compare? The advertising business has worked out all sorts of happy comparisons. We haven't troubled to for the very reason we mention.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are talking about the cost of reaching 1,000 homes per commercial

minute in television; how you could apply that to newspapers is beyond my comprehension. After all, you can look at a newspaper for 4 hours if you want to or a minute, whatever you want.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, my testimony is that it is done this way.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is part of the craft?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, part of the delicacy.

MR. COYNE: In the succeeding paragraph No. 11 you say:

"Television has a great potential impact
"on its viewers, but there are several
"distinct disadvantages to advertisers".

You list a number of disadvantages. I would like to ask you whether these are disadvantages inherent in television, or are they matters which could be alleviated in some way so that the disadvantage to the advertiser would be reduced?

MR. WRIGHT: Some of them are -- they are not inherent in the absolute sense, no; some are of a more permanent character than others. The cost factor is one that we have all seen and, as far as one can see, because of the demand of the human mind and eye, is always going to be relatively expensive as against other media. There are two views, but I think there is a prevailing view because of the long contracts. We pointed out one of the disadvantages of television advertising is the inflexibility that comes from long contracts. I don't think that we would like to argue that

television ought to be ---

MR. COYNE: On a spot basis?

MR. WRIGHT: Spot basis or a short basis entirely for this kind of show. It doesn't have to be this way. That is the way it is. It means that the advertiser who is taking 52 for some reason, or 26, is in a very inflexible position. He is not in the other forms where he can turn off and on as he wishes.

MR. COYNE: They are pretty long-range?

MR. WRIGHT: Not to the same degree I am instructed; I don't know.

(Page 3015 follows)

MR. COYNE: But these are all disadvantages in spite of which advertisers are prepared to pay for advertising on television because of this effect?

MR. WRIGHT: That is the situation at the present time. There are factors that mean that the position of those who live on advertising in television is not a secure one unless they can deliver the audience at economic rates.

THE CHAIRMAN: I did not understand what the point of talking about disadvantages is, when you are also saying what a great, unsatisfied demand there is and want more stations.

MR. WRIGHT: I think in the very context I was referring that it cannot be assumed that there will be advertising support for any television programme, and these are merely set out as some of the factors that qualify enthusiasm of an advertiser for television.

MR. COYNE: Then turning the page to page 20.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Could I ask a question on this first?

Mr. Wright, we have been told that the C.B.C. do not recover the full costs of production from the sponsors of the programmes. If they were to recover these full costs would it affect your clients to the point where they might decide not to use T.V.?

MR. WRIGHT: I do not think there is any

doubt of it. I think the advertisers agree with the point of view that was put forward by Mr. Dunton; by negotiation these particular figures have been arrived at, and I think the position of the advertisers is perfectly clear on that--if the so-called full costs were required, there would not be support for these programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: If that is so, how can you in your summary item 13, when you are talking about how this can be done at the top of page 7, you are suggesting by these words:

"By conducting the commercial business
"of the C.B.C. on a commercial basis" --
if you are going to conduct the commercial business of the C.B.C. on a commercial basis, aren't you going to recover cost of the programme?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, but you are going to have more general appeal than some of the programmes they are seeking to sell.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I am not talking about the nature of the programme.

MR. WRIGHT: I wonder if I might refer to what Mr. Dunton said at page 186 on this issue, because I think he stated -- 185 and 186 --

"Any advertiser who associates with a
"Canadian programme, that becomes, to a
"large extent, a matter of cost. As I
"pointed out this morning, advertising
"costs are even more when we make the
"available charge. With Canadian

"productions, as with imported pro-
"grammes, there are a number of pro-
"grammes that associate themselves
"with, and they are in a reserve cate-
"gory, they are the type of programme
"we think should be on the air, and
"would not interest sponsors very much."

That is one of the difficulties with that type of programme.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes, but naturally I am talking about the type of programme that would be attractive to a sponsor, and if that is the case and they endeavour to recover the total production costs, would the sponsor still be willing to advertise?

MR. WRIGHT: It is the general view, yes, but it depends on two things. It depends on coming up to the requirements you have stated, and it depends on the actual cost. There is a difference of view, I think it is fair to say, as to whether shows can be produced at the cost, about the cost of producing shows in Canada, but until we have some competitive means of doing so, there is no proper way of testing it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think what we are trying to get at here: Let us assume a programme is open for commercial sponsorship by the C.B.C. -- let us take the General Electric Hour, and any other one you like to choose as an example -- you say they ought to conduct their commercial business on a

commercial basis. I take it from that that you are contending that programme should charge the full freight, — should be charged by the C.B.C.?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, that is what I am contending.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see. Thank you.

MR. WRIGHT: And if it cannot recover, then it should become more sensitive to the people who are paying.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Actually, by putting on programmes and having programmes sponsored without getting the full cost back, they are subsidizing certain corporations to the detriment of others in the same line of business? Would you agree with that?

MR. WRIGHT: I agree with it on behalf of half of my clientele, and I disagree with it on behalf of half of my clientele.

THE CHAIRMAN: The simple point is, you say the C.B.C. ought to be conducted on commercial lines, and that entails charging the full cost of the programme?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. I do not think advertisers would have any objection to the type of thing going on that is now going on, and if there is a show for which some commercial money could be secured -- although it is not necessarily a commercial show -- and it doesn't come up to the qualifications that I have described, it might be sold for less than cost to some advertiser just to get the

money. But that is done on a contractual basis with people deciding how much they are ready to pay for it. But as it is now, these shows are C.B.C. shows, so that it is not really possible for the purchaser to say what would be the situation if they were entirely his, and that is one of the advantages of competitive stations, because it does enable that type of thing to develop.

THE CHAIRMAN: This recommendation is not dependent on there being other stations?

MR. WRIGHT: No, but I am saying it is one of the advantages.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us simplify it by leaving one of the stations out.

MR. WRIGHT: Very well.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are saying as far as commercially-sponsored programmes are concerned, they ought to be charged the full cost?

MR. WRIGHT: That is right, but I must qualify that by saying I can see no objection, if there are programmes that are not effective commercially, that they should be paid for to the degree that they are effective. That is a little Irish, I am afraid.

MR. COYNE: Just following this point for a moment, Mr. Wright. This dilemma has been posed to us in these terms: That American, rather elaborate American network programmes, cost -- and this is just a figure out of the air for the purposes of illustration -- \$30,000. And the C.B.C.

or anybody competing commercially, say in Toronto in the television advertising market, is going to be competing with that programme. The C.B.C. at the moment apparently is able to put on a programme which is relatively comparable and of sufficient calibre to warrant putting on the Canadian network in competition with the American show and under sponsorship at a cost, of, say, \$10,000. But something less than -- but the sponsor of that programme is only prepared to pay something less than \$5,000 toward the cost of that programme.

Now, are you suggesting that if there was competition in this field, and if only the something-less-than-\$5,000 was available to pay on a programme, that a programme could be put on at that very much reduced cost which would compete in a commercial sense with the \$30,000 American show?

MR. WRIGHT: I am not aware of proportions of that kind. I think the position of the advertising business on the point that you have put to me is a divided one. There are some who feel that even with the discount it would not be -- I am sorry, there are some who feel that with the discount the C.B.C. is providing shows for less than comparable shows might be provided privately. There are a good number who feel the reverse, that if you had private production you would have very much cheaper costs and yet have shows suitable for commercial purposes.

MR. COYNE: Cheaper to the extent of

something less than 50% of present cost?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Is there anything more than their feelings to back up this proposition? Have there been any studies made?

MR. WRIGHT: No, I do not know of any studies. I think it is unfair to say this lies in the realm of spirit.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wright, leaving out the \$30,000 American figure in this illustration, and refining it down to a present Canadian programme which costs \$10,000 for which the advertiser is only prepared to pay \$4,500 -- now, how do you think the programme comparable to that programme is going to be produced on a strictly commercial basis?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, my first point with regard to that is that the advertisers as a group and those in the advertising business are in no position to admit or deny validity of the costs as produced by the C.B.C., and as a group they do not know how those costs are made up and they have not been told, and they have been told they will not be told, so that as far as the advertisers as a group are concerned, they do not stand convinced of the validity of the \$10,000 figure in the instance you have given me.

In the second case, in the second point -- I am subject to correction in this -- but the variance and the variation which you have given to me is greater than the usual variation that I have

heard of.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are only quoting figures we have been given.

MR. WRIGHT: I am told it comes to the advertisers with delight and pleasure that they are paying more and they are receiving less discount than has been disclosed to you. Generally, the discount is not of the order that you have described.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let's take it as 6,500 instead of 4,500.

MR. WRIGHT: I have just made two thousand dollars.

THE CHAIRMAN: What I am really putting to you, and I think Mr. Coyne is too, there is another way this could be done, and that is producing cheaper programmes in more senses than one.

MR. WRIGHT: That is quite so.

THE CHAIRMAN: And they might be cheaper in quality as well as in cost.

MR. WRIGHT: That is so, and cannot be avoided; but until we try, we don't know. And the fact is now that you can only produce one kind of programme on one basis of cost and with one standard of quality.

Now, if there is only one standard of quality and only one basis, only one standard of cost, then we have an ideal system, but there may be two voices in the matter. We should have a system with some effective competition establishing these things. I think another thing that might be

considered, and would certainly ease the advertisers on something that is disturbing them a great deal, is a much more satisfactory system of knowing how -- know what the costs are. The basis of their submission is competition is the best way to establish those costs, although once you start to make things cheaper to save money, you may make them cheaper in other senses of the word.

MR. COYNE: On page 23, on this same point, you say:

"The cost of producing live shows in
"Canada is not yet justified by the
"commercial return."

What I find a little difficult to follow is that, admittedly in this period even if it is only a matter of uncertainty, how are businessmen going to be persuaded to invest in facilities to produce Canadian shows, say for a second station, where there is such a tremendous hazard and uncertainty involved?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, Mr. Coyne, I do not know how they are going to be, but I would hazard a guess that if you -- I can give you two ways of describing it. If you open to public application the privilege of having a second station in Toronto, I am quite sure you would have six or seven applicants in the field tomorrow morning, and if you turn to this hall and ask those in the hall who would care to hazard their future on a second television station in Toronto, you would find most of that highly-informed audience would be on their feet if

they thought they could get it.

MR. COYNE: I quite understand that, Mr. Wright, if there is no limitation in importation of American films from the United States, but if there was as a condition to the license a requirement, let us say, of 40% of the programming on that station should consist of live locally-produced Canadian shows, are you sure that the same answer would be given?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, I think one has -- yes, I think you would have the applications -- the difficulty is that the restrictions you define have to be defined more exactly. Is a junior hockey game a locally-produced Canadian show with Canadian talent? Members of the Talent Union say "no". But it is pretty Canadian. Does that count, or doesn't it count?

On this point, the way in which I am putting this forward, is that as far as our submission is concerned, and as far as the matter appears before this Commission, the terms on which that development goes forward are going to be settled by the C.B.C., and we are putting forward on that basis, not necessarily because there are 170 businesses in Canada that are waving a flag for the C.B.C., but the C.B.C. are there, and that is the job they are doing; and we feel that these difficulties that you raise are going to be difficulties of the C.B.C., if it has second stations, going to be something that they will have to attack, and

going to be something that, from our experience and from the necessities of the matter, they will attack reasonably fairly.

In other words, they won't define in Toronto for a second station any more than they do in some of the existing television places now, conditions that prevent the thing making an economic success. In Toronto and a number of other places the potential of revenue is such that it is perfectly possible to do that and still get out of the operation the very kind of thing that you and the Chairman are referring to; better Canadian programmes may not be many, but as many as you can get out of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would, I take it, feel it would be unfair to open the thing to a second television station without precisely defining the terms upon which it must operate?

MR. WRIGHT: No, I wouldn't say that. I think this is in a field that I find it a little difficult to deal with. Because at the present time it is a field that is closed by Government policy.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but I am saying if the field were opened by Government policy, it would not seem fair to open it and let an applicant get his investment in and then start cracking regulations at him if it were not present in his mind when he undertook his investment?

MR. WRIGHT: No, except I am expressing views that I think these regulations would be

realistic in most circumstances, but that is perhaps a personal view.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 20, where you are dealing with national expenditures, you say in the first sentence, paragraph 3:

"It has been recognized that capital

"charges of the C.B.C. should be paid

"out of public funds."

For purposes of clarification I am wondering what you mean by "capital charges paid out of public funds". I understand funds are made available by way of loan to the C.B.C., but those loaned funds are amortized so that the funds are ultimately paid for out of revenue.

Do you have in mind there should be some matters where the Government in effect should put up equity capital that will not be amortized or paid for?

MR. WRIGHT: What this sentence means is what the rest of the paragraph means. The last two Commissions have said this, capital expenditures should be paid out of public funds.

MR. COYNE: You may be reciting what the two Commissions say ---

MR. WRIGHT: That is all I am saying.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wonder if what the Massey Report should have said -- capital cost of a national broadcasting system be provided from public money by Parliamentary grants. That may be the physical way in which you get it, but as we

understand at the present time these are coming entirely in the way of loans to the C.B.C., which is not the same as saying capital charges are paid out of public funds.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, but it is the same as the Massey Commission said. It is the same as the Aird Commission said.

THE CHAIRMAN: And I am raising the question, if it is the same as the Massey Commission said?

MR. WRIGHT: A Parliamentary grant is not a Parliamentary loan.

THE CHAIRMAN: My understanding is in the main capital costs of the C.B.C. have been provided by loan, not by being paid out of public funds.

MR. WRIGHT: I have not discussed this with my clients, but I have very little doubt that they, and I think a great number of people connected with broadcasting in Canada, feel it should be made by grant and not by loan, and one of the things that has brought about the financial difficulties of the C.B.C. is that it has to finance itself by pulling on its own shoelaces. Our point is, as it is stated, we are submitting it in accordance with the other two Commissions, that they have studied it. Parliament may not be doing it this way, but that comes in a different department.

MR. COYNE: On page 23, Mr. Wright, you say about halfway down paragraph 8 -- you are referring to the discount that the C.B.C. provides

on its network shows -- you say:

"They encourage support of this policy
"by offering separate but related in-
"ducements to particular advertisers.
"They discourage and impede it by
"refusing to disclose the real costs
"by denying the advertiser or agency
"any effective or audible voice in
"the production or personnel of these
"shows and by rejecting any financial
"advantages that could be gained by
"competition".

My question is: What financial advantages could the C.B.C. gain from competition?

MR. WRIGHT: Learning how to produce its shows more cheaply.

MR. COYNE: But surely the most significant effect which a competitive station would have in Toronto, say, would have upon C.B.C. revenue, would be to cut them by a very substantial proportion because the C.B.C. would then be sharing its present audience with another outlet.

MR. WRIGHT: With respect, I do not think that is so. I do not think -- what in effect, if I may say so, you are saying to me is, acceptance of American shows in Toronto is something that cannot be changed, the C.B.C. has done its best job, it is only going to get so far, and that is as far as we can go, but that is not so.

MR. COYNE: You think the audience for

the second station will come exclusively, or very largely, from the audience that is now watching Buffalo stations rather than the audience which is now watching the C.B.C.?

MR. WRIGHT: This involves me in a gift of prophecy that is quite beyond me, but I think the chances are extremely good. I think a complicated thing will happen. I think you will find more and more people watching Canadian stations if you have two Canadian stations operating in the City of Toronto, and I think you will find a larger Canadian viewing audience growing up. I think the same thing has occurred in radio. I do not see in this instance why it should not also occur in television.

MR. COYNE: Take the City of Winnipeg where they cannot receive United States television programmes at the moment. They have one C.B.C. station. Do you feel that there too if there was a second outlet, it would not interfere with the revenues which the C.B.C. now derives from its Winnipeg station?

MR. WRIGHT: I am not in a position to speak with any voice on the situation in Winnipeg. I do believe in this, as in a great number of other things, that competition means business. Even in a non-competitive field which is familiar, I do not think there is any doubt that in most communities there is more work for both of two lawyers than there is for one lawyer. In a strange way, if you have two of them scratching away at each other, it

seems to make more business for both of them.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is because lawyers are quarrelsome fellows.

MR. WRIGHT: My point is, they could not be more quarrelsome than some of the people that operate broadcasting service.

THE CHAIRMAN: Take your Winnipeg situation, you have so many sets today. They can only listen to the television station that is there. You put a second television station in tomorrow; are your clients going to be prepared to pay as much for the coverage that the present C.B.C. station is giving in Winnipeg with a second station there as they are paying today?

MR. WRIGHT: Without an increase in those -- in the number who are viewing, no.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think ---

MR. WRIGHT: But they are advancing it because they believe a great number more would be.

THE CHAIRMAN: Saturation in the Winnipeg area is very high.

MR. WRIGHT: Where the little eyes are watching this, that is a different matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is nothing else to watch.

MR. WRIGHT: With due respect, you don't have to watch just television in Winnipeg.

MR. COYNE: Are you taking the position I suggest to you, or the counter position, that your principals are satisfied that if there were competi-

tivative T.V. outlets in the present C.B.C. centres, that the revenue of the C.B.C. would not suffer as a result?

MR. WRIGHT: That is certainly true of Toronto, and we think it is true of most of the C.B.C. centres.

MR. COYNE: Despite the risk they would be running of enjoying a smaller share of the total audience because there would be additional competition?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, that certainly is the view of the people who instructed me.

THE CHAIRMAN: While you are on this point of financial advantages that can be gained by competition, you did -- I just want to be sure -- go along with the suggestion I put forward this morning that there are also financial disadvantages arising out of competition?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am thinking of the competition working at the talent level in raising the cost for both?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, there is an economic disadvantage, but as I tried to put it, I do not think that particular thing -- that is something we can say is a disadvantage in our whole life.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, but you are talking here about financial advantages to be gained by the C.B.C.

MR. COYNE: Then, I would like to turn to page 31, Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: May I just deal with the situation in Winnipeg, because I am informed by someone who knows more about it than I do that at the present time the bulk of the support that goes into Winnipeg through the members of this Association is this national advertising. It is their view that would just continue. What would happen locally ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you say that would discontinue?

MR. WRIGHT: No; that would just continue.

MR. COYNE: But surely the card rate, or the rate for time for even the national advertisers buying on the network, is dependent, broadly speaking, upon the number of listeners that they are getting at each of the outlets?

MR. WRIGHT: No; it is dependent on what the C.B.C. says you will pay for it. The only privilege that you have as an advertiser is to say: "It is too much and I won't take it at all."

THE CHAIRMAN: Isn't that the way most goods are sold?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes; but this is on this question of the C.B.C. having to charge less for Winnipeg because there is a separate station. Make no mistake about it, it is the view of the advertisers that it wouldn't charge less if you asked the C.B.C.; it is their view that it wouldn't

charge less.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will have to ask them.

MR. COYNE: Turning, if you will, to page 31, you are dealing here with the attitude, if you like, of the C.B.C. and the influence that there may have been upon that attitude exerted by the Massey Report, and you say in paragraph 10 that this attitude has led to a disregard of commercial and economic factors.

What I would like to ask you is if you are in a position to recommend any specific way in which you feel that the commercial side of broadcasting in the C.B.C. could be strengthened? You mentioned something in your presentation this morning about compartmentalizing the programme activities as between commercial and non-commercial, and I am wondering whether you could make any specific recommendation as to strengthening the commercial side?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, Mr. Coyne, as an Association we have no suggestions and we have no recommendations. That is a question that is for the Commission and the Corporation to decide.

Now, we haven't them for several reasons, but one of the reason is that if anybody in the commercial field advocates anything in broadcasting it is at once assumed that the only reason for advocating it is to take away something requiring the spirited defence of the people in the country, and we have avoided it in our brief and I avoid it now -- saying that we advocate any particular change.

We say that is for the Commission, if it chooses, and certainly for the Corporation to consider. We say there should be changes.

Having said that and, I hope, made it clear, I would like to suggest some things that might be considered. Now, one would be to put the commercial division of the C.B.C., or the commercial work of the C.B.C., on a salary and other basis comparable to Canadian business doing the amount of business that they are doing. I don't know what the salaries are, but they are open to you, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, and it seems to us that that is one thing to be considered; and if you look at them and find that they are out of relation to what is being done in other businesses in Canada, then you will have it clearly shown to you that what is happening in the C.B.C. in some aspects and for some people is that there are people in the C.B.C. who are giving their lives in the dedicated work that they have undertaken; and that isn't right. If they are in there and in there doing a job -- and, of course, we are only concerned with the commercial field -- then they ought to get paid and they ought to get paid what they would get in the United States of America. That is a suggestion.

Actually, we didn't mean to make any suggestions, but you have asked us what we would recommend. That is something that we say you might find very interesting to look at. I don't say it in any tone of opposition, of saying that to the

C.B.C. -- indeed, I would think that the people in the commercial department would have listened to what I said with considerable relish and pleasure.

The second thing ---

THE CHAIRMAN: You are not doing that on the basis of altruism or equity; you are doing it because you think you would get better commercial management?

MR. WRIGHT: That is right. We think it would make for a more efficient commercial department. We want to stay out of the league who are saying that particular people are only getting what they are worth. That is why I say there is a great deal of dedication going on and people carrying on in their jobs at less money than elsewhere. There are all kinds of people in the C.B.C. I am not casting halos around every head!

The second thing is only a matter which might be considered, but it has advantages. At the present time, particularly in television, the work of the C.B.C. is centered in Toronto and Montreal -- the production work -- and it has occurred to some of us that if there were an assistant manager with a commercial background in charge of C.B.C. operations in both these centers it would lend weight to the process which we are advocating.

Now, we had another one which I advance with even more temerity than I have the previous ones, and that is the creation in the C.B.C., under the Board of Governors, of a commercial board

charged with the conduct, on a commercial basis, of the commercial business of the C.B.C. This isn't the way it is done now. I have heard, as you will have heard, a good deal about the partnership that is going on in the C.B.C., and speaking for myself I couldn't be more in favour of that conception of partnership and national service and the one great round team working together. But, in fact, I doubt very much if that is what is really happening. You have meetings, you have committees, you have all these things, but you haven't in the C.B.C. an organ representing this partnership.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are speaking of the partnership between private stations and the C.B.C.?

MR. WRIGHT: Primarily; but I think in the type of television that has developed and which, we submit, will probably have to go on, the advertisers are partners in it to the same, if not a greater degree. We aren't asking anything for the advertisers, but if the conception is one of partnership we suggest that partnership does imply more than you find now in the organization of the C.B.C. You find people who are ready to discuss your problem, ready to deal with the matter on a committee basis, but we think there should be -- we are merely putting this forward for consideration -- some organization -- it may be a Board of Directors under the Board of Governors -- to operate the commercial business in a very much more commercial way, and also for suggestion of discussion purposes have a

majority of C.B.C. officials, but add a status in it for those people who are, in effect, in the partnership.

Now, I have tried to put that forward and to make it clear that it isn't designed as any attack on the national system; but you asked, in order that it should be more commercial and practical, what things could be done. Those are some we would advocate. But there are others. There is what I opened this afternoon with, and that is on the vigorous sale of products here and in the United States and elsewhere on a commercial basis. For the business world there are a great number of things that could be done commercially by the C.B.C., and this is one of them -- in selling. Now, selling may not appeal to a number of people who are charged with these responsibilities, but selling is one thing which is required if we are to get money from overseas from our broadcasting activities here; and that has to be done on a commercial basis and in a commercial way.

THE CHAIRMAN: We don't need to go into that now. You know that there are all kinds of conflicting factors in that aspect, based on labour agreements and -- based particularly on labour agreements. We have had this up several times, as you perhaps know, at the hearings.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Wright, you deal in annex "K" with the French-speaking problem, and you also dealt with it this morning in your initial

presentation.

In paragraph 8, on page 39, you say:

"A definite policy of public support

"of French-speaking programmes is

"required in the national interest."

Well, now, my question is: In this context is there any real difference between English-speaking and French-speaking, because I think we might also make the statement that a definite policy of public support of English-speaking programmes is required in the national interest.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. I think our point with regard to French-speaking programmes goes a little further, and I think we feel that if French-speaking programmes of the quality that is being given now are to be continued under any system then the commercial programmes will require some public support in order to provide that type of national service.

MR. COYNE: The question is one of degree, is it?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes; it is one of the added expense.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think on this aspect Mr. Stewart was asking you some time ago -- and I was, too -- for the commercial programmes to be put on a commercial basis you thought that that would mean that the programmes should be charged at full cost; but I take it you are aware that for the French programmes you can't get sufficient quality

with the size of market?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Paying the full cost?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Then, I would like briefly to deal with your final annex on future developments, and my first question arises out of your reference to the extension of micro-wave facilities, and I would like to ask you -- you say this is not a policy dictated by any pressing business requirement -- I would like to ask you whether simultaneous transmission by micro-wave in some cases is of advantage to the advertiser, or is it something that is a help to have?

MR. WRIGHT: No, generally not, because what the advertiser is looking for in every case is the same time-slot, and he doesn't get that if he has a standard time ---

MR. COYNE: So that the advertiser could receive just as adequate and satisfactory a service without any micro-wave facilities at all; is that true?

MR. WRIGHT: No, that is not true. With video tape, now, the programme can be taken off the tape and given three or four hours later, whereas under the present system it has to be moved out physically, and that entails delay. So that with video tape, going West in our country, the advertiser can, in effect, enjoy the same hour right through the country, West of Toronto and Montreal.

MR. COYNE: I see that; but even a delay

of a matter of three hours involves a micro-wave relay, because without micro-wave relay your delay may be seven days?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, that is right.

MR. COYNE: Is there any disadvantage in a seven-day delay?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, there is a disadvantage. It is not a vital one, but you get dead people talking, and references to events that didn't happen, and seasonal changes.

MR. COYNE: Then, you say in reference to the micro-wave system that the cost of that should be met by general taxation, and I would just like to ask you what you have in mind. Do you envisage that as something apart from the C.B.C. and the cost of which should be covered in some other way?

MR. WRIGHT: No.

MR. COYNE: Are you suggesting that, for example, there should be no inter-station inter-connection charges to the advertisers?

MR. WRIGHT: No, I am not; and I am not really in a position to discuss that in detail. I think I would have to appraise the use of these facilities.

MR. COYNE: So there is no particular significance to your statement?

MR. WRIGHT: No; it is not designed to make a particular point.

MR. COYNE: Why do you say in paragraph 7 that if colour television policies are developed

on sound commercial principles then this development should attract new advertising revenue? Are you suggesting that there would be some revenue available under colour that isn't available in the black-and-white?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. I think there is no doubt. Wallpaper manufacturers, for instance, and there are all sorts of other people whose product depends on colour. If they had the advantage of colour advertising some of them, I think, would tend to go into that to the exclusion of anything else, because they can't get tele-colour advertising except in magazines and, in a restricted way, in newspapers.

MR. COYNE: And these are, actually, then, new markets which would only open up if there were colour in television?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. COYNE: That completes all the questions that I have, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any questions, Mr. de Grandpre?

MR. de GRANDPRE: I have just a few.

Mr. Wright, you have suggested that there should be competitive stations, and we have heard a lot about the cost of producing programmes and of dividing the costs among several stations in order to bring it down to a more reasonable level. Then, is it not a logical step that you will eventually have another network of private stations in order to compete on a full-scale with a

national system?

MR. WRIGHT: Not necessarily; obviously if you have the advantage of being able to put out your shows on other stations in Canada your ability to produce better programmes is increased, but that that should necessarily be a network of private stations doesn't follow. In fact, it is impossible in Canada without the permission of the C.B.C. That is just one of the things that we say is answered by our acceptance of the present situation, the present organization.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But do you say it is impossible because of C.B.C. control, or what?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Or is it economically impossible?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, I don't know enough about it to say whether it is economically impossible or not; but I say that is in the hands of the C.B.C., and that is the type of responsibility that they ought to be discharging.

THE CHAIRMAN: But I think the question is whether you, or your clients, think the economy of Canada would stand two national television networks.

MR. WRIGHT: I think the general view is not at the present time; but they have all sorts of acceptable network arrangements which could be made, that would produce more revenue, but not on the full national network basis at the present time.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You have made the broad statement at one point that advertising must also be available to its sponsored programmes which would appeal to the advertiser.

MR. WRIGHT: The advertiser isn't trying to sell to himself.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But which would appeal to listeners and, therefore, would have some appeal to the advertiser to invest money in that particular programme. This question has been often put to us, that some programmes which are carried in the United States and which are also carried in Canada are sponsored in the United States and not sponsored in Canada. It is the same programme. It must have a similar appeal to the listeners. You have these differences. Is it because the cost is prohibitive in Canada while it is not in the United States?

MR. WRIGHT: I am afraid that is a matter in which one would have to deal with specific items. In some cases the product isn't sold in Canada, and in others the advertising budget in Canada is prepared in an entirely different way.

MR. de GRANDPRE: What I am trying to find out is the real reason why the programmes are not sponsored in Canada. Is it simply a matter of policy, or is it also a matter of cost, or strictly a matter of cost?

MR. WRIGHT: As I say, without knowing individual cases, I don't know. There are all sorts of factors. I think the first reason why U.S.

programmes can't be sponsored in Canada is because C.B.C. control it and ---

MR. de GRANDPRE: You want to be specific. I will give you a specific example. Yesterday the Seaway Project was sponsored in the United States and was not sponsored in Canada. That is a very recent example.

Is it simply a matter of cost, or is it a matter of appeal to the public at large?

MR. WRIGHT: I think the C.B.C. should answer that. I don't think it was offered to anyone in Canada. I think it was sold to magazines in the States.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: It was sold to General Motors in the United States, but General Motors in Canada turned it down -- the same company.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, I am sorry, I didn't know that was the fact, and I am surprised. There was more than one advertiser on the show in the U.S., and, secondly ---

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: In fact, the N.B.C. in the United States couldn't even charge the full cost to General Motors, because it couldn't stand it; and in Canada, of course, it was beyond possibilities. Apparently the N.B.C. put it on more as a prestige performance rather than for revenue.

MR. WRIGHT: I would be glad to find out what the reason was.

MR. de GRANDPRE: There is a last question which is of interest to advertisers, and it

deals with a suggestion that has been made to us on various occasions also, that indirect advertising would appeal more to the public than direct advertising.

I would like to have your views on that.

MR. WRIGHT: I represent 170 Canadian businesses that are interested in advertising, and while they do a fair amount of indirect advertising there is just no doubt, so far as they are concerned, that they know that direct advertising is the most effective advertising.

It seems to be a general view that if a Canadian business or company were directed by a group of university professors -- and they are considered to be a group above reproach by anyone in this quarter -- that they would adopt some different method of conducting the business of advertising their goods. Well, certainly, the interests I am in, and, I would say, common sense, suggests that if they had the same problems in this field they would solve them in the same way; and the fact is this, that we have built up a good deal of our economy on direct advertising. Even in the Aird Report you have an indirect effort to stay away from direct advertising.

To look at the picture as it has developed in Canada -- and it has developed out of real things, not out of some policy that somebody has been trying to push through -- it has developed because the way to sell the type of goods that are sold by radio advertising is by direct advertising. I wish

some butcher would come before this Commission and tell them the number of his customers who go in and buy Canada Packers because it sponsors one of the symphony concerts from Toronto. I just don't think it is a factor. That type of thing is done as goodwill advertising, but it doesn't sell goods or services in the way that we are discussing.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You did mention that advertisers feel that they would lose the benefit, or a portion of the benefit, of their advertising money if they were to rely solely on indirect advertising.

MR. WRIGHT: I think, as compared with what they had, they would lose most, or practically all of it. It may be possible to sell some things, but it wouldn't sell the type of things that Canadians are making and selling. Those kinds of things are sold by direct advertising, whether you like it or not, or whether it is very pleasant or very unpleasant.

THE CHAIRMAN: And this is the price you pay for your progress, as you said this morning.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I don't know whether you would care to answer this or not, but it has been put to us on different occasions throughout the country that the C.B.C. are not sufficiently aggressive in going after advertising. I wonder if you have any comments on that, or if you would care to make any comments on that opinion that has been presented to us?

MR. WRIGHT: I have two comments to make about it. First, so far as radio is concerned, it is the declared view of the Massey Commission that they should not be aggressive and that they should not compete in the local field. I think that most of the people I represent and those who are associated with them in advertising would support this view, and this is one of the things really that we were arguing for, that if the commercial activities of the C.B.C. were conducted on a more commercial basis, and if they went after advertising, they would find that the C.B.C. revenue from this source could be immensely increased.

But I am not suggesting any criticism. I am just saying that I think there is no doubt that in advertising, if the C.B.C. chose to become aggressive commercially, why, with the franchise it has got it has a tremendous commercial opportunity, if that is what it wants.

THE CHAIRMAN: But if you are so sure of the effect of competition ought the C.B.C. to compete in the local radio advertising field?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, so far as the local radio advertising field is concerned I am just a little constrained by my past, and while ---

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't want to embarrass you at all.

MR. WRIGHT: I certainly agreed with the view of the Massey Commission so far as radio is concerned. In this whole field, though, it seems to

me that you are faced with a rather different view, and undoubtedly one potential revenue is this quick local revenue available to the C.B.C. in radio; and we want to make the suggestion, as you get on in the matter you are to examine in the Order-in-Council, that, if you chose to, this is a matter which you could re-examine and perhaps come to another conclusion.

THE CHAIRMAN: At least we could take it that you would state that the virtues of competition are not capable of being isolated in television and don't apply in radio?

MR. WRIGHT: I would agree to that one. I do say, however -- I think it is obvious that I am speaking personally -- that the situation that faced the Massey Commission with regard to radio was a very different situation from the one that faces you. It was a matter of finding \$2 million to make the C.B.C. non-commercial.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have only one additional question at the moment. It relates to your summary on page 5, item 11, having regard to your contention that you are arguing that Canadian television should become more commercial -- you say that in No. 4 under item 11 -- to the degree Canadians want, and you suggest Canadian programme advertisers will support them.

Is it fair to assume that the contention comes through the fact that the programming of television emissions will very largely be dependent

upon the mass of the people?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, so far as the advertiser is concerned, yes. An advertiser wants -- most advertisers want -- that majority audience, or that mass audience. Well, that isn't entirely true. A vendor of pianos is in a special position, and I suppose a vendor of Cadillacs is.

THE CHAIRMAN: But it does mean that if you are to depend for the financing of that to a greater degree than at present on commercial revenues it will necessarily mean that the programming of television will depend more and more on the mass popular appeal, taken over-all?

MR. WRIGHT: I think, yes, that that is a fair statement to make. It seems to have some untold criticism in it --

THE CHAIRMAN: I wasn't meaning any. I was wondering what it means. Is that your contention?

MR. WRIGHT: I think, undoubtedly, of course, it simply means that if we are to spend this much money we have to look to the numbers of Canadians that it is being spent for. As I said, in the radio field, really it boiled down to a matter of two or three million dollars that had to be found to make the C.B.C. completely free of any commercial motive in radio. That is a different matter. But here we are dealing with tens of millions of dollars.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we have got your

viewpoint very clearly, but it may be that we will have to ask you to come back.

We thank you for the attention and patience you have given to our questions.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you very much, sir.

(Page 3051 follows)

SUBMISSION OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS OF
CANADA

APPEARANCES:

Mr. J.S. Angevine.

Mr. S.C. Symington.

Mr. Donald McGregor.

Mr. E.D. McDonald.

Mr. R.C. Rae.

Mr. H.A. Ward.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we are to hear is from the Young Men's Christian Association to be presented by Mr. Angevine and a number of others. We will mark your brief Exhibit No. 122.

EXHIBIT NO. 122: Brief of Young Men's Christian Association.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Angevine, will you please introduce those who are with you?

MR. ANGEVINE: Mr. Chairman, we have lost one or two of our men, but we will carry on as best we can. I might say at the outset that this committee presenting this brief is a national committee of the Y.M.C.A. co-ordinating the work of three of our major committees in the Association, the Physical Education Committee, the Boys' Work Committee and the Adult Programme Committee, and I have with me representatives from those committees: Mr. McGregor, Physical Education Committee; Mr. Symington, Boys' Work Committee, and Mr. McDonald, Adult Programme Committee. There is also Mr. Rae

and Mr. Ward.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you present the brief as seems best to you. You can speak to it, if you prefer -- perhaps you can do that, or you can read it if you feel that is a more expeditious way of dealing with it.

MR. ANGEVINE: I don't want to take too much time. Would it be all right if I read the preamble and then underlined portions of it?

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well, and then we will have our questioning.

MR. ANGEVINE: Mr. Chairman and members of the Royal Commission on Broadcasting, the Programme Committee of the National Council of the Young Men's Christian Associations of Canada congratulates the Commission on its efforts to secure a cross-section of Canadian opinion on the problems of Canadian broadcasting. We appreciate the opportunity offered to organizations and individuals to present their views on this topic because we believe the public should periodically assess the purposes and principles of our broadcasting services. An assessment can be especially significant at the present time because of the impact of television as a comparatively new medium of communication.

This National YMCA committee has drawn together expressions of opinion on national broadcasting from the point of view of YMCA programme. The views of all YMCA members are not represented, but the National Council of Canada's autonomous

YMCAs and YMCA-YWCAs -- in a few cities there are joint Associations -- does assign to this Committee the responsibility for over-all and long-range programme planning. In its co-ordinating function this committee works through specialized committees which give particular attention to work with boys, girls, youth, and adults in physical education, recreation, informal education, religious education, and other programmes. This this Programme Services Committee may claim to be competent in making this presentation.

We agree with the premise that the responsibility for broadcasting should be vested in the Parliament of Canada. We recognize, too, that the details of discharging that responsibility must be delegated to some authority established for the purpose.

The open platform: We believe every issue should be open for discussion, subject, of course, to the dictates of good taste established by the broadcasting authority. Broadcasting should not be allowed to fall into the hands of those who would use it to propagate only one view of human nature, society, the state, or religion.

We would recommend that programme policy be aimed at including high quality programmes for those appreciative, even if small, audiences. The policy should not be limited to offerings of programmes of mediocre material which are assumed to be of interest to mass audiences.

Programmes dealing with points of decisions or conflict which concern vital areas of life should be included in any plan of broadcasting.

We advocate the continued search for provocative methods of presentation of ideas so that the audience will be stimulated to further thought or action on its own.

We feel that the national broadcasting service could enlarge its activities in the field of stimulating and training new writers, artists, performers, speakers and the others who are required.

Under the heading "A Sense of Canadianism", we consider a national broadcasting system as probably our most effective medium in promoting a sense and understanding of Canadianism in all parts of Canada.

We see an increasing need for the national broadcasting service to enlarge its staff of foreign representatives who will be able to provide and interpret the information necessary for understanding of international affairs.

Community co-operation: We suggest the extension of the use of advisory or consultative relationships between the programme departments of the national broadcasting service and the national headquarters of community organizations.

Those recommendations are summarized on pages 11 and 12 of the brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: I hope you don't feel we have restricted you in the presentation. You

know we have had the brief and it has been read and will be read again.

MR. ANGEVINE: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do any of your associates wish to elaborate at this stage on specific points?

MR. ANGEVINE: I think we are prepared just to answer anything.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Angevine, turning to the first recommendation on page 2 you say:

"We agree with the premise that the responsibility for broadcasting should be vested in the Parliament of Canada."

And then you say:

"We insist that the authority must be independent of political control so far as its policies and decisions are concerned."

Do you feel that the present set-up, with the C.B.C. responsible to Parliament as it is, meets that requirement that it be independent of political control?

MR. ANGEVINE: The only difference would be the change of Parties in power. I presume there is political control in a way there, but as far as we are concerned, I think as long as it is responsible to Parliament that is all right, and we haven't stated whether it should be an independent group or the C.B.C.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are talking about the general public control of broadcasting in the

national interest, rather than any specific mechanics of how it is done?

MR. ANGEVINE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the point of the question is that you feel it is better to have that responsibility directed towards Parliament rather than, as has been suggested, placed under a Department of Government -- or has this been studied by your committee?

MR. McDONALD: In the discussions on this with the three committees there was a general feeling of agreement with the present system set up for control. However, we felt that this system should always be subject to review by Parliament, and that that is the last court of resort. We felt that somebody, such as was intended in the present set-up, needs always to be in existence that can be strongly enough protected in its frame of reference from the Party in power, if you want to put it that way.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 4 where you are dealing with mass and minority interests, you say about the middle of the page:

"Increasing leisure, as one element,
"is tending to change the need from
"the purely entertaining type of pro-
"gramme to something that is creative."

I wonder if you could expand your ideas as to how that development is taking place?

MR. ANGEVINE: I think we are all

agreed, of course, that under present conditions with a five-day week, and the hope of a four-day week, and so on, there is an increasing pleasure period, and I think possibly one thought that is in there is that if programmes could be of such an educational type that the listeners or the watchers would be taught certain crafts, and that sort of thing, for occupying leisure time -- exhibits offered under television so they could see how these things are done, that would give them something to do other than just watching as a spectator.

MR. COYNE: You refer to the need: Do you feel we are getting to the stage where there is a greater tendency to look at that sort of programme rather than the purely entertainment type?

MR. ANGEVINE: I would think it is largely entertainment at the time, and it is perhaps a thing that could change the thinking of the people and give them new thoughts.

THE CHAIRMAN: But the question is, who feels the need? Is this the need of the people who have studied the field? Is there a need in the public audience for it and they are looking for it and want it?

MR. ANGEVINE: Personally, I would not say we have had much expression to us there is the need at the time.

MR. McDONALD: I would like to add one thing: The point raised is a very valid one. We are the Young Men's Christian Association, and

we therefore have a point of view on life, and I think in the same way as the previous group were reporting to you, they were reporting both from the public's point of view of need and from their own, and I would certainly say that in our interests in this brief we feel that there are points made in the brief which we feel are important to Canada and important that Canadians get involved in, despite the fact they may not feel the need any more than the school boy feels the need for going to school.

MR. COYNE: What I was really interested in bring out, if it were so, was whether you had detected an increased demand among people for programmes more of the educational or informational type to the extent they will listen to or view those programmes when they come on, rather than switching over to something else which is pure entertainment? Is there in your experience a development?

MR. ANGEVINE: I think there is a development.

MR. COYNE: Is there a public demand for this sort of programme?

MR. ANGEVINE: I can speak from personal experience: There is a definite interest in that type of thing by the younger people watching the programmes, and they will frequently turn to a channel on television where there is something really interesting of that nature as against some of the Westerns, and so on. I have four boys, and I have an idea of their likes and dislikes.

MR. McDONALD: Just an illustration:

I imagine we are less scientific than most of the groups who appear before you, and therefore cannot give you very good answers, but I do know this, that in the Chicago Y.M.C.A. they worked out arrangements for a demonstration of crafts programme. For the next two days they had to reorganize their telephone services to handle the requests about getting involved in that kind of programme, which would indicate that there are methods open to television for demonstrating creative activity, which are open in no other channel.

MR. COYNE: Turning now, if you will, to page 7, you say:

"We feel that the national broadcasting
"service could enlarge its activities
"in the field of stimulating and train-
"ing new writers ...",

and then you have this statement:

"One of the great related problems that
"should be tackled by the broadcasting
"authority and trade unions is the
"question of the union status of casual
"participants in broadcast programmes.",

and then in the final paragraph below:

"The broadcasting authority should
"work with the trade unions in attempt-
"ing to find a way to make this kind
"of participation possible without
"union membership and without fee."



I wonder if you would just explain in a little more detail what the present situation is and how it works as an impediment?

MR. McDONALD: This is a particular point I wish to speak to. I think there are three points we want to make: First of all, we want to make that the unions in the field, which are more than one, have made a tremendous contribution and are very necessary organizations in the development of Canadian talent. I want to make that very clear.

Secondly, we really do feel that the unions have a valid concern about the preying upon musicians that can take place in broadcasting, and it is a very valid concern that they have.

Thirdly, that there is no easy answer to the point that we are raising. The point we are raising is this: In broadcasting it seems to us a number of functions are performed. Two of the functions are, the function that is to produce an artistic show of some sort -- a production -- where the status of the participants is a very clear and valid artistic status that should be categorically qualified by whatever the contracts are that exist around union membership of the participants. We feel, however, there is a field that is a broadcasting field and that has become tangled up with the first function I talked about, which you might call the documentary function of broadcasting, and in the documentary function of broadcasting essentially

the participant is not an artist even though he may be a very highly qualified professional, or he may be a rank amateur who would never be engaged as an artist. For an example, I could, just to give you one illustration of what I mean, say that it is a very difficult thing, for instance, if an organization produces a high quality production, let us say, in music; it is an easy thing to work with that body on a production basis, namely, to engage the body to produce a show for broadcasting. That is easy and quite clear, but where the difficulty comes in is where the other valid premise of broadcasting -- namely, the documentary -- has to move in on this body that has created this show in order to show the community what this body can do. This is a documentary function and it is a very difficult one to actually achieve under the present arrangements in broadcasting. Quite specifically, in our Y.M.C.A. just a little while ago -- and we don't get into television very often, and sometimes we don't because of this problem -- we had a show produced for an open house display; it is an annual affair within the Y.M.C.A. where we are showing the public what we do. Very naively we made arrangements for this particular thing to be presented on television; namely, they moved in and televised the show. However, all of a sudden, the show got stopped and the producer said, "I am sorry, we will have to start all over again. Who put on the music?" The problem was that this did create

a problem for the production. The music simply tangled up the conditions under which the show could be put on television. In that instance it didn't break up the show. We re-did it by a certain method which was acceptable, but we had no immediate way of taking steps to correct that. In our Y.M.C.A. physical education we do a lot of things to recorded music, and in this we run into a lot of things which we didn't realize were so complicated in what was essentially a documentary rather than from the point of view of a show being for television.

MR. COYNE: The show could not go on with the music?

MR. McDONALD: That is right.

MR. COYNE: If you knocked the music out, it was all right?

MR. McDONALD: Yes. In this instance it didn't knock the show apart, but there are instances: if you wish examples, in most situations, an amateur singer, for instance, may sing provided the musician who is accompanying the amateur is a union member. An amateur instrumentalist may not perform without a stand-by who is a Musician's Union member. What I am getting at is that it seems to me the problem is clear, namely, that the union is trying to protect the professional in the field, but what I am trying to get at is the problem that should be tackled, from our point of view, jointly by the broadcasting authority and the unions is one of distinguishing, if it is possible,

between what is a production that requires regulations on the artist, and a documentary, where in many situations what you are doing is recording something that is happening in the community.

MR. COYNE: Would it be fair to say what you are suggesting is that the C.B.C. and trade unions get together to find a solution which would provide protection for the legitimate aims of the unions?

MR. McDONALD: Quite.

MR. COYNE: But without leading to these silly results that turn up on occasions such as you mention?

MR. McDONALD: That is it. If I may, one good example of how this is recognized, is the church service. The church service is never complicated with it. It is looked on as a documentary inasmuch as there are no requirements restricting union status.

MR. COYNE: On page 10 you say in the paragraph which begins near the top of that page:

"In another way, the broadcasting system
"could assist by making available, for
"non-commercial use, after the original
"presentation, the kinescopes, tapes,
"recordings or scripts of programmes
"which have values to community groups."

I suppose you are suggesting, in effect, a library of films of shows that have been presented and could be made available to organizations?

MR. ANGEVINE: That is right, like in

our organizations, from the sport angle for the physical department, and educational for other groups, which could be used to advantage.

MR. COYNE: It has been brought to our attention already that here again it may be necessary for the trade unions and the C.B.C. to get together.

MR. ANGEVINE: There must be a lot of valuable material that is seen once, and it may be shown on the wrong day from the standpoint of the young people. They may be somewhere else. It could be used not only immediately following, but a year after, or just like any film library.

MR. COYNE: In your recommendation No. 9 on that same page you say:

"We suggest the extension of the use
"of advisory or consultative relation-
"ships between the programme departments
"of the national broadcasting service
"and the National Headquarters of
"community organizations."

I wonder if you might just expand a little on your idea there? We understand at the moment there is a National Religious Advisory Council, and I believe there is also a council advisory to the C.B.C. on school broadcasts. Do you have anything specific in mind with regard to the sort of activities your organization is concerned with?

MR. MCGREGOR: One of the things the Department of Physical Education is vitally concerned in is the health attitude. It seems to me we are

- 205 -

all aware if we were to base our health practices on the kind of things we are told over the radio, or broadcasting, we would be in a bit of a problem, and it seems to me the Canadian Medical Association or any other medical body ought to have some opportunity of determining whether the health claims of various advertisers are valid and in the interests of the general public. This principle could be expanded in other areas. Most of the attitudes and the programmes around sport are put on and promoted by professional athletes, and there are organizations in Canada like the Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation who have some opinions about these matters; but it is the attitude and opinion of the advertiser that is always used, and I think this idea of using the information of national bodies in order to validate either advertising claims or any other programmes is an important one to us.

MR. COYNE: As far as advertising is concerned, there are some regulations at the moment, I believe, regulating the advertisement, say, of foods and drugs. You are suggesting, though, still more active and more extensive system of consultation?

MR. MCGREGOR: Yes, I think the present regulations are inactive.

MR. COYNE: Do you think there is any danger in the extension of such consultative relationship, any danger akin to censorship, if you

like, the forcing of particular opinions of concepts or professional views down the broadcasting public?

MR. MCGREGOR: No, I wouldn't think so, where the organization is reputable. I would presume their opinion is based on scientific information they have available. I would put my faith in them before I would an advertiser, whose only interest is to push his product.

MR. COYNE: And you contemplate this as an advisory function?

MR. MCGREGOR: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we thank you very much for coming. We appreciate having your brief, and we will give it consideration.

SUBMISSION OF TORONTO BROADCASTING COMPANY
LIMITED (CKEY)

APPEARANCE:

Mr. Jack Kent Cooke.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we have is from CKEY. I understand that you are busy tomorrow, Mr. Cooke, and will find it inconvenient to be here.

MR. COOKE: I think you know why I am busy tomorrow, and I am very grateful to you for arranging to hear me at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think your commitment

tomorrow is very definitely tomorrow.

MR. COOKE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Cooke, we will first mark your brief as Exhibit 123.

EXHIBIT NO. 123: Brief of Toronto Broadcasting Company Limited (CKEY)

THE CHAIRMAN: If you will present it in outline form, we will sit long enough, and as long as necessary, to hear you and question you.

MR. COOKE: In view of your kindness and co-operation in this whole matter to me, and because I am certain that you have already read the brief, I think that it would be redundant, wouldn't it, for me to start to read it or even summarize it at this time?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you might make a brief summary just to bring it back into our minds.

MR. COOKE: One of the difficulties may be your definition of "brief" and mine may be entirely antithetical.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, take your time.

MR. COOKE: Well, rather than summarizing it I will start off, if I may, by touching on some of the high spots.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is fine.

MR. COOKE: I am President of the Toronto Broadcasting Company which since August, 1944 has operated Radio Station CKEY in Toronto.

During my term of management, this radio station has grown from an uninspired and relatively

unsuccessful Canadian outlet for an American radio network into an independent, non-network, fully Canadian operation. Then, as a consequence of programming what the majority of Canadian listeners desire to hear, and by doing it skilfully and consistently, CKEY has become one of the most successful operations in the Canadian radio field.

The basis of our operation is the effective presentation of the recorded folk music of the American continent, a high content of news and sports, and a dedication to the public service. These policies have resulted in attracting to our spot on the radio dial the greatest number of listeners tuned consistently to any Toronto station, by the most reliable survey standards available at the present time, coincidental radio audience surveys.

There is an appendix on page 26.

Our staff is Canadian, and one of the largest engaged in any single station operation in the country. It is a staff which enjoys many benefits which do not accrue to employees of many private companies of similar size.

We have served the community, to the best of our ability, in times of disaster and of well-being. We make substantial contributions to the employment of live talent musicians each and every year, and that exhibit is on page 30, and we have sought to encourage the development of Canadian talent in the acting field.

In the process of achieving this success,

our company has earned substantial profits from radio broadcasting. We broadcast more commercials than many other stations. In doing so, we are content to abide by the judgment of the majority of our fellow citizens as to the propriety of our actions. We live and die by the size of our audience. Should that audience register resentment of a high commercial content in our programming by turning us out, CKEY would speedily resort to some other approach to the business of broadcasting. So far, the majority of my fellow citizens commend CKEY for its policies and programming, and give us their vote of confidence by continuing to dial 580 more than any other station in the area.

It is against this background I approach your Commission. I approach it with respect, tinged with apprehension. I believe your findings may determine the fate of mass communications in Canada for generations to come. I submit respectfully that, although your task is to consider the future course of radio and television, your findings may influence future Government action in regard to the whole field of publishing, of which broadcasting must be considered an important part.

You will be approached by representatives of many minorities, who may expound before you the virtues of a state-owned system of radio and television which has considerable virtue in their eyes.

I submit that the great danger inherent

in hearings of this kind is that the average man and woman -- the average Canadian -- will not be represented here, either through ignorance of his right to be heard or reluctance to express his opinion outside the confines of home, office or the polling booth.

THE CHAIRMAN: At that point I would like to say there is a wide number of personal representations, and I would not want anyone to think that those submissions are the only ones we have had or the only submissions which will be considered.

MR. COOKE: Thank you.

I submit that CKEY, which I have the honour to represent, understands and programmes for the mass of the Canadian audience. In appearing before you, I have the impression I speak for millions who otherwise might have no effective representation.

This Company believes with Abraham Lincoln that Governments should only concern themselves with those matters which free enterprise cannot do equally well. A fundamental law of an effective and real democracy requires the scope of Government to be rigorously restrained within the limits of that Lincolnian dictum. A Government, however well intentioned, which essays to tamper with this fundamental law, is doing violence to what are properly the inalienable rights of the citizens. It is within this context that this submission will deal with the following topics:

(a) The nature of broadcasting.

- (b) The State and Broadcasting in a democratic society.
- (c) Blueprint for free enterprise television.
- (d) Multiple ownership.
- (e) The case for private networks.
- (f) The 'bogey' of Americanism.
- (g) Some comments on an independent regulatory body.

I don't think it would be fair for me to carry on with the highlights of the following and succeeding chapters, because I think it is covered pretty well there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we will proceed directly to the questioning.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Mr. Cooke, you mention that your station has grown into an independent non-network fully Canadian operation?

MR. COOKE: Yes, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do I understand that you have absolutely no network commitments?

MR. COOKE: None, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: None whatsoever?

MR. COOKE: None, sir. In 1944 when the station was acquired the station was a member of the Mutual Broadcasting System, and I think immediately on the date of acquirement of the facilities of the station, an abrogation of that contract with Mutual was sought -- I know it was, because I did it, and I believe it took 60 days or 90 days, or

some such time.

MR. de GRANDPRE: What do you mean by a fully Canadian operation, do you mean all your programmes are of Canadian origin?

MR. COOKE: I mean all the people who put on our Canadian programmes are of Canadian origin.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But what about the other programmes, that is what I am driving at?

MR. COOKE: What do you mean by that?

MR. de GRANDPRE: What is the percentage of Canadian programming that you have on your station and what is the percentage of programming which is not Canadian in the sense that it originates from other sources than Canadian sources?

MR. COOKE: You are referring to the recordings and the transcriptions?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Well, I want to know how much live you have and how much recording you have so we will be able to have a fair idea of the percentage.

MR. COOKE: I beg your pardon. I would say that the bulk of our programming is based on the announcers, writers, the personnel in the station, the library, I believe there are 10 in our library choosing skilfully the type of music which is going to be broadcast on CKEY; the writers, continuity and script which we believe is going to appeal to our audience; the recordings of the various orchestras, the singers, instrumentalists, a small percentage of whom happen to be Canadian, the large percentage

happens to be American, European, English or Scotch.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But that refers to the recorded programmes that you have on your station?

MR. COOKE: Yes, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I take it that you have programmes which are not recorded, of course?

MR. COOKE: Yes, we have.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And what would be the proportion of the recorded programmes compared with the live programmes on an average during an average week?

MR. COOKE: Well, we broadcast, as you know, 24 hours a day, so whatever proportion I give you now is obviously going to be weighted against the live talent content of the station simply because, from 12.00 midnight to 7.00 o'clock in the morning, it is hardly likely you are going to have very much live talent on the air. If I were speaking of the time between 7.00 A.M. and midnight or, say, 11.00 P.M., which would be, I imagine, the normal time during which you could expect to broadcast, I would say that the sports broadcasters -- that would be all local events of hockey, baseball or football, the Art Hallman group, all the local musicians' unions, the various public service programmes that we put on such as "The Mayor Speaks", would represent a reasonable percentage of the whole. When I add to that such performers, which they are rather than announcers, as Mickey Lester, whose programme runs from 8.05 to 9.00 P.M. nightly who, as I say,

in the true sense of the word is a performer and whose programme is probably 40% Mickey Lester and 60% recorded music. I would say obviously that proportion would increase.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Because I am trying to reconcile these figures with the figures that you mention in Appendix "B" at page 30.

MR. COOKE: I beg your pardon?

MR. de GRANDPRE: At page 30 you say in your brief that you have served the community to the best of your ability in times of disaster and you make substantial contributions to the employment of live talent each and every year, and then you refer to a table, to Appendix "B", and you give a figure of \$29,584.17 a year.

MR. COOKE: For what?

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is what I do not understand.

MR. COOKE: For musicians and drama, it says. Now, I said a few minutes ago, and took some time to define what we believe to be truly Canadian talent; unfortunately, some of these things are a matter of segregating; by "talent" I mean an announcer just as much as I mean a musician or actor. On our staff last year we spent close to a quarter of a million dollars for those performers.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But out of this \$250,000 you spent only \$29,584 for musicians?

MR. COOKE: Musicians and drama workshop. As I said before, the bulk of our programming

evolves around the personnel of CKEY.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And these are independent performers only?

MR. COOKE: Precisely, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And amongst your personnel as live talent you only refer to your announcers and some writers?

MR. COOKE: And writers.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And some editors and sports writers?

MR. COOKE: Sportscasters, etcetera.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But as far as the live theatre is concerned, or live music is concerned, on CKEY it is limited to the amount of \$29,500?

MR. COOKE: Yes, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, you make a rather broad statement at one point that the Commission will be approached by representatives of many minorities who may put before us the submission of a system of State-owned radio and television. You know we have received representations from the Canadian Labour Congress, from the Farmers Unions of various Western Provinces, and from the Provincial Federations of Agriculture, and so forth? We have, or I have, speaking for one, gathered the impression that these were not minorities, but, rather, the majorities. Why do you say these are the minorities?

MR. COOKE: I did not say they were the minorities, did I?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Well, representatives

of many minorities?

MR. COOKE: That is right, but I did not say what you say ---

THE CHAIRMAN: On page 2, the second paragraph, you say:

"You will be approached by representatives of many minorities ..."

MR. COOKE: That does not say all the minorities, does it?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think what Mr. de Grandpre is putting to you is, that the people who have been expounding this position of a State-owned system, that many of them are claiming to speak for large numbers of Canadians.

MR. COOKE: Yes. That is not the intention of the sentence at all.

MR. de GRANDPRE: As you know, these representations were made to us by these groups where -- or are representations which have been made in the past by the same people, and if the same representations were made to us again this year, is it not a fair inference to say that the representative views of the members of these associations, otherwise the executives of these associations, would have been told not to make the same representations again; is it not a fair assumption to conclude that?

MR. COOKE: Well, I think there is part of my brief that would lead me to believe that, as far as the City of Toronto is concerned, perhaps the assumption is based on misinformation or some

such thing -- I do not know how there could be many majorities, but let that go aside. We say in one instance here -- you are familiar with the information I am referring to, is that what you are getting at?

MR. de GRANDPRE: I want to find out if these surveys were made at your expressed demand?

MR. COOKE: Oh, I think I say so; I have forgotten the precise phraseology, but I think I said I retained Elliott-Haynes to do these surveys; yes, certainly. May I add this: I knew when the surveys were made that, unless I had taken leave of my senses, the information must be similar to the information that they developed; they are a reputable organization and would not be coerced by any money or any influence I might bring to bear on them. Common sense led me to this: that if the majority of listeners are listening to CFRB and ourselves, it meant that among that majority must be a large number of the labouring part of Toronto, and if there is a large labour part, then logic dictates that a large portion of it must be union.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Paragraph 5, on page 2, you say:

"This Company believes with Abraham
"Lincoln that Governments should only
"concern themselves with those matters
"which free enterprise cannot do
"equally well."

MR. COOKE: May I amend that? I do not think a company can believe anything, really a

company is an intangible thing existing only in the contemplation of the law. Let us say I believe that.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I will not hold you down to your company. The point I want to -- the question I want to ask you is this: Do you feel it would have been possible for free enterprise to give a national broadcasting service to Canada?

MR. COOKE: Very definitely.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And to serve all the areas?

MR. COOKE: They do now, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: With the help of the C.B.C. to some extent?

MR. COOKE: I beg your pardon?

MR. de GRANDPRE: With the help of the C.B.C. to some extent?

MR. COOKE: In what way with the help of the C.B.C., may I ask?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Well, we have been told that it would be impossible for certain stations to give a daily programme without receiving the network productions of the C.B.C.

MR. COOKE: Well, I have been told queerer things than that. I started in 1937 in Stratford, Ontario, in a little station; there was no money in the station; for 14 weeks I would have pay cheques in my pocket that I could not cash because we did not have enough money, yet we were able to operate that station very well without the C.B.C. The C.B.C. would not give us any network affiliation

in those days, would not consider it. We were on our own. But we operated the station well and we satisfied the people of Stratford. Then I went up North and operated stations in Timmins, Kirkland Lake and Val D'Or and we operated those stations well, and I know what it is like to operate stations without network affiliation, and I also know who pioneered in providing the hinterlands, the bush part of Canada, with broadcasting facilities. I know because I was one of the ones that helped to do it. Even at the late date of 1937 it was not made possible because of the C.B.C. Now, if you had said to me, did the C.B.C. encourage this and develop a source to send out to all of Canada, I could not help but agree with that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us go back to this point Mr. de Grandpre is asking you about. Let us take your own station, CKEY; I am not questioning it, I am merely asking you to expound how you feel your station contributes to a national service in broadcasting at the present time?

MR. COOKE: It does not contribute to a national service of broadcasting, sir, simply because it is not allowed to build a network across Canada, and I imagine the national, in the generic sense, binding Charlottetown with Victoria ---

THE CHAIRMAN: What I am thinking of is slightly different to that; it is not a question of networks; we have had it put to us that one of the functions of broadcasting in Canada is the

importance of this phrase in various ways, tying Canada together from East to West, bringing a knowledge of Canadian conditions in one part of the country to those people living in another part of the country, developing in the broadest sense, and the term, as it has been outlined to us, the notion of a distinctively Canadian culture. Now, I am not saying that individual private stations ought to be participating in this function, but I think Mr. de Grandpre's question was that this is certainly something that we have been told the C.B.C. has done. If you have, in addition, contributed to it, I would like to hear about it.

MR. COOKE: Well, I think that my former answer would stand and that is: it is impossible. As I understand you now, sir, perhaps if we had more time to discuss this I would have had a different understanding than I presently have; but as I understand you, it would be necessary to have networks to accomplish the purpose you set forth.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me expand the idea a little bit. There would be nothing at all that I can see to prevent you putting on, as was suggested to us in Winnipeg, in your station, a programme outlining the milestones of Canadian history if you chose to do so. There would be nothing to prevent you putting on a series which would attempt to interpret to the people in Toronto a picture of life in French-Canada -- that type of thing.

MR. COOKE: I see now what you mean.

THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, the concept that has been presented to us -- and I am not saying that we adopt it or do not adopt it -- as far as the importance of helping in this business of building Canadianism -- and I am simply asking, if I may, what your station has contributed to the building of Canadianism?

MR. COOKE: Well, Canadianism or Torontoism, I guess you would call it, I think are not too far apart here. We have concentrated mainly on building a greater understanding of our community and we believe if all of the stations in Canada operated as fully to build our own network here, that the final summing up in this community enterprise will result in a greater Canadianism that you speak of. We believe that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I am not pressing you.

MR. COOKE: I do not understand exactly what you mean?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not solely independent from the network privileges, it is something which goes to the nature of the programme and the importance of this medium ---

MR. COOKE: I would agree with that, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Going to page 4, the fourth paragraph, you say:

"The C.B.C. has discharged with commendable results a part of its original responsibility."

Then I am skipping a sentence and then you say:

"It formed an uneasy alliance with
"commercial sponsors, without whose
"money it would have been difficult
"to exist."

What do you mean by the "uneasy alliance" made between the C. B.C. and the sponsors?

MR. COOKE: That is one of the reasons I would have liked to have had a private hearing. I do not believe -- I heard the latter part of Mr. Wright's comments about the C.B.C. and their commercial operations -- I do not think they are too keen; if they had had an opportunity, if it had been possible for them to operate without the money of the commercial shows coming from the sponsors, I believe they would have preferred to do so. I have said, I believe half a dozen times there, this is strictly my own opinion -- I believe that that describes or that supports the words that I have used there of an "uneasy alliance".

(Page 3083 follows)

MR. de GRANDPRE: Because it was imposed upon the C.B.C. by the circumstances?

MR. COOKE: Because of exactly what I have said here. It would have been difficult for them to exist on the money they had at their disposal had they not had the additional revenues as a result of this uneasy alliance referred to.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Why is it an uneasy alliance?

MR. COOKE: I tried to explain that, and I will try in a different way. No, I can't; there is only one way to say it. I think if the C.B.C. had been able to operate without sponsors that would have been the ideal arrangement, as it was with the B.B.C. in England. That would have been joyful. This was less than perfection, I think, having to barter with the advertisers and the agencies to accomplish two things, to get many popular shows, and then to accept the payment for those shows, I think.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You don't mean "uneasy"; you mean "reluctant".

MR. COOKE: Mr. Turcotte, I think you are absolutely right. I wish I had said "reluctant" in the first place.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You come to the point where you are describing the nature of broadcasting on page 5 of your brief, and you say that broadcasting is publishing?

MR COOKE: Yes, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Is it publishing in its

true sense, or in a very wide sense?

MR. COOKE: No, I think in its true sense. Look up the Oxford English Dictionary, to see the word, and the Oxford English Dictionary is a pretty good one, and it is our Bible in this country, and it leaves no doubt in my mind what "publication" means. "Publication" is, to quote that dictionary, the action of publishing, or that which is published; the action of making publicly known, public notification or announcement, promulgation, notification or communication to those concerned or to a limited number regarded as representing the public. At the bottom it says, "a man may tell his wife a thing and that is not publication" -- that is interesting, isn't it? Or, "he may tell his next-door neighbour and that is publication".

THE CHAIRMAN: That is based, I should tell you, on a very special rule of law.

MR. COOKE: On this subject of publishing, they publish the banns in the Anglican Church, and it is not necessary to resort to impressing a piece of paper with type. It is done by the minister announcing it. The Town Crier was practically the precursor of all publishing. He didn't put things on paper. Interestingly, in Canada a magazine or periodical is not published when it is printed -- not at all. It is published when it is sent out to the public. A periodical is deemed to be published legally when copies of the publication are distributed to the people or

offered for sale. So then, this, to me, Acronis-
tic idea that publishing is only printing or writing
or typing does not hold water. I am publishing
right now.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are broadcasting too.

(Laughter)

MR. de GRANDPRE: Would you say the
film industry is publishing?

MR. COOKE: I do.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You do believe the
motion picture industry is publishing?

MR. COOKE: It is a form of publishing.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Why is it that you are
against censorship or regulation, or call it whatever
name you want to call it, for broadcasting and I
take it that you agree with the censorship laws re-
garding the film industry -- do you?

MR. COOKE: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Why is there such a
difference?

MR. COOKE: What did you say -- the
censorship regarding film -- what did you say?

MR. de GRANDPRE: You agree that there
should be censorship laws?

MR. COOKE: No, I don't necessarily agree
with that. I wanted to make sure I heard the first
part of what you said. I thought you said that
I understood there was censorship, and I do under-
stand that.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You are against it?

MR. COOKE: No, I am not in favour of it. We publish that in Saturday Night so often. You should really read the articles; they are awfully good.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know that we are going to allow commercials here.

(Laughter)

MR. de GRANDPRE: I take it you are against any form of regulation against broadcasting or the film industry or for any kind of publishing?

MR. COOKE: No, I wouldn't go so far as to say that. That is an outrageous generalization. What I do say is that I am against a form of latent or inflected censorship exercised over broadcasting through the medium of their programmes. I subscribe to the footnote on page 5 of the brief, which is an excerpt from the F.C.C. Regulations,

"Nothing in this Act shall be understood or construed to give the Commission the power of censorship over the radio communications or signals transmitted by any radio station, and no regulation or condition shall be promulgated or fixed by the Commission which shall interfere with the right of free speech by means of radio communication."

That, of course, was emphasized by Mr. McConnaughey

on the 29th November, 1955, when he said:

"I respect with near reverence that
"part of our legislation that keeps
"Government away from prescribing
"programmes ... Let me reassuringly
"add that we bureaucrats on the
"Commission do not pretend to feel
"that we know what is good for
"the people."

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you believe that
all parts of broadcasting fall within the definition
of "publishing" -- news items, music, theatre?

MR. COOKE: Those parts that you have
mentioned, I do, yes.

(Page 3088 follows)

MR. de GRANDPRE: Are there some that do not fall within that category?

MR. COOKE: Well, you speak of parts of broadcasting, there is lots of work done in broadcasting which is not publishing, it is the beginning of publishing.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Everything that is put on the air is part of the publishing?

MR. COOKE: Pretty well, yes, sir. That would be subject to qualifications that may occur to me as we discuss this thing, but I would say at this moment, pretty well, yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, where does this take you, Mr. Cooke?

MR. COOKE: The publishing, sir?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Let me just think out loud for a moment. Surely there are distinctions between these various media of communication?

MR. COOKE: Such as what, sir?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, you have in the newspaper field fairly large emphasis on news, you probably have less emphasis on entertainment features; in movies you obviously have a very high content of entertainment and a relatively small emphasis on news. You also have distinctions between the media as to the difference between the newspaper which, to a large extent, can still be started by anyone who wants to take the commercial risk and has the money to do it in a medium where there are very definite limitations by the physical

factors of the situation. The number of people that can enter the field ---

MR. COOKE: May I deal with these two now? I was going to jot them down because I thought there would be a number of points. First, the newspaper: I have taken one of the Toronto papers-- and I won't vouch for the accuracy of this, it is reasonably accurate -- you talk about news content of the newspaper; this particular newspaper on the particular day -- admittedly it is not fair to take one newspaper for one day, but I did not take the Thursday newspaper because I would have been appalled. On this particular day the advertising in the paper was 75.4%; staff-written news represented 8%; foreign agencies represented 1.58%; Canadian Press and British United Press represented .39%; the comics represented 1.58%; syndicated features, 1.89%; and, therefore, I submit there was a very small percent devoted to news, unless you consider advertising news and I do, in a way, say it is news.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Would that be a desirable state of affairs if that were carried into the field of a national broadcasting system?

MR. COOKE: You mean this proportion?

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Yes?

MR. COOKE: Good heavens! You own that national system, I do not want any part of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well then, what about this relatively limited accessibility to the media?

MR. COOKE: Oh well, you saw me wince

when you said that. I would like to know how to get a daily newspaper in the City of Toronto, and I have the money, as you know; I would like to know how to do it. You cannot do it, it is impossible -- well, it is the next thing to impossible. Mr. Turcotte is smiling, I know he must agree that is so.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, you go on to say on page, the last paragraph ---

MR. COOKE: I think the Commission should at least supply me with a glass of water.

THE CHAIRMAN: I did not mean to put you under such necessity, Mr. Cooke.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You say that the C.B.C. does not require the control of the means of distribution of these programmes?

MR. COOKE: Where are you?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Page 6, the first paragraph.

MR. COOKE: Where is it?

MR. de GRANDPRE: It says:

"It does not require the control of
"the means of distribution of these
"programmes."

"It" being the C.B.C.?

MR. COOKE: That is right.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, as you know, the C.B.C. Act as it is today imposes upon the C.B.C. the obligation to carry on a national broadcasting service within Canada, and in order to give this national service it uses private outlets

throughout the country, it uses its own outlets wherever they are and it also uses private outlets where there are no C.B.C. facilities; and it has been put to us that in order to carry out this responsibility the C.B.C. needs the authority over these private outlets and that you cannot divorce responsibility and authority. Would you like to comment on this?

MR. COOKE: You have reference now, I imagine, to the last sentence:

"Such distribution could easily be
"arranged on a co-operative basis
"through free enterprise networks."

MR. de GRANDPRE: Yes.

MR. COOKE: That would be a matter of negotiation. I am reasonably certain it could be arranged so long as common sense was used. I recall well a time in Timmins; at that time I think there were 10 farmers in the area, and at that time we had an affiliation with one of the C.B.C. networks -- I think it was the Trans-Canada Network -- and we were carrying a programme called "The Farm Forum". I believe that was the name of it. And we begged the C.B.C. to be excused from carrying that programme because we said -- and it was true -- you could count the number of farmers in this district; nobody is interested in this programme and why do you insist we carry it? However, insist they did, and carry it we did. That is what I said a few minutes ago when I said to use

reason in these things, and that is the reason I used the word negotiate; it can be negotiated, I know it can, it is done all over the United States.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But the networks in the United States do not have a legal obligation to carry on a national broadcasting system.

MR. COOKE: You do not need the legal obligation, they discharge a form of Americanism, you will excuse me, equally well to us. They do a fine job. They do a fine job of promoting, whatever it means I still do not know, the cultural programmes; they do a fine job of inculcating in the Americans a greater desire to be better Americans and the best people; whether they are or not is beside the point, but I think they do pretty well in causing them to feel that, and I think that is what the Chairman had in mind when, earlier, he spoke about Canadianism.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us take that one stage further, though, Mr. Cooke. It has been put to us and I think it is pretty clear that Canada is in a very special position in the world as being, probably, the only example in the world of a relatively small population living beside a very large population and, in the main, speaking the same language.

MR. COOKE: Scotland would be an excellent example.

THE CHAIRMAN: I say, "in the main speaking the same language", but had there not been a Canadian national policy which was recommended by a number of inquiries, both Parliamentary and

Commission, which led to the provision of the Broadcasting Act, Section 8, which reads:

"The Corporation shall carry on a
 "national broadcast service within
 "Canada."

Do you not think that that very effective job of Americanism salesmanship in the American system could have had a pretty profound influence on Canadianism?

MR. COOKE: No, sir, I do not. I believe, as I said later on in this brief, I have an abiding confidence in the good sense of Canadian people, and I do not believe it is necessary for anyone from "on high" to spoon-feed them anything -- Canadianism, nationalism, or anything else. They are intelligent people, they are wise people, and they prove that consistently, and I do not believe this is necessary. I think, had we in the first instance had an opportunity to operate private commercial networks in Canada, we would have had just as much of this live talent as everyone is talking about. How can one radio station here hope to compete with a group of radio stations of 25 or 30 where the costs of that live talent is amortized over these 25 or 30 radio stations? Mr. Turcotte, how can one newspaper compete for the service of a writer when another newspaper syndicates that writer? It is an absolute perfect analogy. The Taylor-Pearson-Carson Organization -- a number of us here in Canada, before radio was in its ascendancy, at the time even when

it was in its ascendancy, could have operated networks and done just as much for this so-called Canadianism. There is nothing wrong with commercialism in radio ---

THE CHAIRMAN: We are not suggesting there is anything wrong.

MR. COOKE: This is something I read the other evening and I think it is interesting; it is by Walter Kerr and is called "How Not to Write a Play". He says:

"This may be a good chapter to skip
"since it is going to contain nothing
"that is not known to anyone who has
"taken a high-school course in Shakes-
"peare. As our English instructors
"used to point out, generally with a
"dryly conspiratorial air, Shakespeare
"was a man with both eyes firmly
"fastened on the box office; this was
"a sample necessity, since the major
"portion of his income came from his
"sharing directly in the day's receipts.
"Shakespeare's competition was the
"bear-baiting pit, and he was always
"concerned to meet it: with murders,
"duels, battles, wrestling matches,
"suicides, ghosts, witches, clowns,
"songs, costume parades, explosions,
"thunderstorms, and plain and fancy
"eye-gouging.

"The plays of Shakespeare came out
 "of a theater dedicated to the proposi-
 "tion that the illiterate was not only
 "welcome but had to be wooed uninter-
 "ruptedly throughout the performance,
 "at whatever sacrifice in taste.
 "Thus dramatic pattern -- busy, blood-
 "thirsty, unblushingly theatrical --
 "had been set by Kyd, Marlowe, and
 "lesser men; Shakespeare made certain
 "interesting improvements on it, but
 "he was careful not to destroy it.

"Moliere learned to play the
 "same currently unfashionable game."

I am just skipping through this, of course, but he
 goes on to say:

"No great play has ever come from
 "what might be called a minority
 "theater. All of the work we prize
 "most highly was born of the commer-
 "cial or at least competitive hurly-
 "burly, and in the presence of a mass
 "audience."

He refers here to what was happening at the time
 Shakespeare was writing these bloodthirsty plays.
 He goes on to say:

"Miss Chute has further reminded
 "us of the contempt that most young
 "university intellectuals felt for
 "a popular professional writer like

"William Shakespeare. The plays
"written by the students of Oxford
"and Cambridge, or by their teachers,
"were in every way superior to the
"crass London product. They were quite
"untainted by commercialism, they
"appealed to educated gentlemen instead
"of London tinkers, and it was un-
"deniable that they were beautifully
"staged . . . The students of Oxford
"and Cambridge were the future hope
"of the nation and it was not fitting
"that their minds should become cor-
"rupted by watching vulgar productions".

"Happily, Shakespeare was fond of
"money and tinkers, and quite indiffer-
"ent to this sort of criticism."

THE CHAIRMAN: That does not exactly bore
us but it is not precisely in answer to my question.
The question I was asking you was: You were placing
emphasis on commercialism as being sufficient to
do this job?

MR. COOKE: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I ask you this: Do
you think that if commercial factors alone had
operated in Canada we would ever had had a Canadian
railway system?

MR. COOKE: I do not know, I do not
think anybody knows.

THE CHAIRMAN: If commercialism had been

the sole method of providing air transport, would we have had an air transport system?

MR. COOKE: Oh, yes, I know that for an absolute fact, and I know that the application for a private air transport system binding Charlotte-town with Victoria was denied.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me put this question to you, then: It has been put to us that -- and I have used the illustration before today, but I am not sure you were here and we have to check these facts -- that an ordinary half-hour programme on television is produced in the States for about \$30,000; we produce a reasonably similar programme here for \$10,000 or \$12,000, not quite as elaborate but a reasonable comparison; but you as an operator of a television station in Canada can rent, or a chain can rent the Canadian rights for the \$30,000 American-produced programme for \$2,000. Now, as a commercial operator, which way are you going to get your programmes?

(Page 3098 follows)

MR. COOKE: And the answer is -- well, the answer is pretty simple to that one, sir. There is an amalgamation of both because the Canadian people want, and I believe have the right, to hear the Jack Bennys and Sid Caesers and the Jackie Gleasons and, at the same, produce our own shows and put them in juxta position to these high-rated shows the same way as CBLT does, sir. They have a programme with they call "Holiday Ranch" which preceeds the Jackie Gleason show--which is an importation -- and is a show that gets a fairly respectable rating as a consequence of preceding the Jackie Gleason show. I believe the Canadian network can do that much stronger as a consequence of the imported American shows.

THE CHAIRMAN: No one is questioning that. I am simply saying, on a purely commercial basis why would a commercial operator ever produce a Canadian show?

MR. COOKE: Well, sir, the reason is that not all the businesses in Canada are owned by Americans, sir. There are a lot of businesses here that have not got access to these originaly shows of the United States because they are purely and simply Canadian companies. They have no affiliation with American companies. Secondly, there are a lot of ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Just stopping there for a minute. Does that not mean that those companies who have affiliation with American companies get

their programmes for \$2,000 and those who have not affiliation with American companies would have to pay \$10,000?

MR. COOKE: It all depends on how much the programmes cost. Not all the programmes are going to cost \$10,000 or \$30,000 or \$300,000.

As a matter of fact, let us say for the sake of argument, we had a major league baseball team here in Toronto.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, let us say that.

MR. COOKE: Let us say it was fait accompli. Let us say it was here. It is not going to cost any \$10,000 to telecast that programme for half an hour. There are going to be all kinds of things; hockey games -- Imperial Oil broadcast the hockey games here despite the fact, I suppose, they are connected with Standard Oil and they could bring over whatever programmes they wish.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to see you get the hockey games and football games.

MR. COOKE: I think the most important part is that it is a fact that no station is 100% commercial. It just does not work out. In theory it is possible, but it doesn't work out in practice and the net result is that the local originator who televizes that network, if that is the broadcasting network which is followed, the private operator is obviously going to have panel discussions; is obviously going to have various other types of what we call public service programmes

so -- I believe that CKEY is one of the leaders in that field. This is going to happen for the privately-owned network.

THE CHAIRMAN: All I say is, that if that happens, I will, for the sake of the discussion, agree with you -- you would have your hockey games, or whatever it was. You would have your other features and that kind of thing; those things that are easy to get at and easier to put on and rather cheap to produce; but where would you get your Canadian dramatic shows or your Canadian musical shows if the features of commercialism are the ones that are entirely to be governed?

MR. COOKE: Well, I have a great deal of confidence in the wisdom of the Canadian people. I have a great deal of confidence in the wisdom and initiative of the Canadian broadcasters and the Canadian telecasters, and I believe they would develop that, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You see, that last answer is far from the question I asked you; whether it was possible to divorce the responsibility and authority and realize this national broadcasting system. Your answer was it could be negotiated or it could be reasonably made, but you need something more than negotiation and reason when you have the obligation to carry on a national broadcasting policy.

MR. COOKE: Well, it is all indigenous in the operation of the network. In the network

in the United States it pre-empts, as it were, or "reserves" is the correct word -- it reserves time on all of these stations. If they haven't got commercials in there, they have these other programmes, which are sustaining programmes -- it may be the New York Philharmonic or it may be heavens-knows-what. It is up to the dictation of the people who are running the programme department, but in those periods those stations will carry these programmes in these radio stations dotted all through the country. I see no reason why they could not suggest such as Timmins did 25 years ago when they said, "We haven't any farmers; please release us from the obligation of carrying this programme".

THE CHAIRMAN: I think, Mr. Cooke, what Mr. de Grandpre is asking about is Section 8 of the Act which says that the Corporation shall carry on a national broadcasting service within Canada.

MR. COOKE: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you believe that provision is a good provision, or should it be changed?

MR. COOKE: I think it would take too long to answer that question, sir. I really do.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right, I will not press you.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Going over the regulations of the C.B.C., they appear on page 7 of your brief, Mr. Cooke ---

MR. COOKE: 7?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Yes. You say that regulation Nos. 4, 5(a), 5(b), 5(c), 5(d), 5(e), 5(f), 5(h) and 5(i) are redundant or superfluous in the main because they deal with good taste, good law and good morals.

MR. COOKE: That is what I said.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You are not against them, you simply say ---

MR. COOKE: Are you against a sin? No, I am not against them. I think that they are all part and parcel of the laws of our country. They do not need the legal imposition of these. We all know what the law of libel and slander is. I have to know in my main business. I must know these things were already covered.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Yes, but are there not instances in the legal field where you have two laws saying approximately the same thing?

MR. COOKE: There must be a better reason for those other instances. I am not familiar with them. Here we guard carefully everything actually that goes on the air. I would speak for, I think, every private broadcaster in Canada, no obscenity, no blasphemy, nothing indecent. Good heavens, it is the watchword of the operation of every radio station that I know of in Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: Summarizing this part of your brief, you do not feel that these regulations are calling for something that should not be called for?

MR. COOKE: They are not an irritant, is that what you mean? They are not doing any real harm.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You are only pointing out the redundancy. There is only one point that I would like to get clear from you on your objection to 5(c).

"No one shall broadcast any obscene, indecent or profane language."

You wind up by saying:

"I have the impression the C.B.C.

"stations skirt this legislation

"more boldly than the private opera-

"tors in the name of so-called

"poetic license."

In other words, neither one of you observe the law?

MR. COOKE: I would say we believe ---

COMMISSIONER STEWART: The C.B.C. seem to do it a little more subtly?

MR. COOKE: I would say that we carry on a hyperexuberance in the phraseology, so I think Mr. Turcotte will understand this better, perhaps, than I do. Let us forget about that part.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Right.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, going back to your brief, page 14; we have already touched this problem when the Chairman asked you some questions about competition and commercialism, but referring to the television problem -- we can summarize this chapter of your brief by saying that you are in

favour of more television outlets and as many as the traffic will bear?

MR. COOKE: Yes, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And that you are in favour of this policy without regulations whatsoever?

MR. COOKE: Without any regulations or anything? Remember, I very carefully said to you before when we were talking about it, you must have regulations regarding allocation of frequencies; you must have regulations regarding channels. You must have all these technical regulations. They are essential to the operation of the station. Otherwise, there would be chaos.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Why do you need these regulations if it is public?

MR. COOKE: Because of the very essence of the animal with which we are dealing here. If there was no overflow from this station A towards station B, 220 miles away, you would need none of them; but there is. So that the station 220 miles away must protect station A.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is the only regulation?

MR. COOKE: I said technical limitation. These were the only limitations one would impose on the new stations. Very similar, not identical, but very similar to the limitations imposed by the F.C.C. on stations in the United States.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Would you give the C.B.C. stations the right to compete on the local

market for advertising?

MR. COOKE: Why not? If there is a need to have C.B.C. stations they have every right to compete. It will all stimulate more business.

THE CHAIRMAN: You think, then, the present policy of the C.B.C. in not competing in the local field for local advertising should be changed?

MR. COOKE: No, I do not say that. I said, "Sure, if they want to compete".

MR. de GRANDPRE: My next question would have been this: If you allow them to compete in television would you also allow the C.B.C. to compete on radio for local business?

MR. COOKE: Of course. I think they do in a small measure.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are told they do not at the moment, as a matter of policy.

MR. COOKE: I could be wrong on that. I think they do so. I may be wrong. I stand corrected, if I am, of course.

MR. COYNE: In a very limited way.

MR. COOKE: Yes, I understand they do compete but the amount of competition -- they compete with private stations, I know, in a very limited way. From the point of view of this aggressiveness, this alertness, this desire, this enterprise, I would like to have them here.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Would that go for all television?

MR. COOKE: Am I correct this is

competition from the C. B.C.?

MR. COYNE: Mr. Chairman, if I remember correctly, it was that in a very limited instance in Toronto radio station CBLT, which is the originating station for the Dominion Network, does compete. If I am correct, I think that is the only place.

THE CHAIRMAN: That may be so. I was thinking of the general rule that in the C.B.C. radio it would be they do not, as a matter of policy, compete for local advertising.

MR. COOKE: They do in a limited way in Toronto, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: I had forgotten that.

MR. COOKE: I am much more positive now since I have heard from Mr. Coyne.

MR. COYNE: That was my understanding of what we heard before.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Did I understand you when you said it should be limited competition, or should it be unlimited competition?

MR. COOKE: I did not say that, did I? I said, "If they want to compete, let them go ahead and compete", did I not -- or words to that effect. I believe all this stimulates more business and more interest in this industrial era, this business, whatever you call it -- call it radio, call it television.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You feel by the mere fact of competition this will assist advertising, or is there a ceiling to what happens? Is that

what you have said, you would have more interest?

MR. COOKE: I think that part of the thing is this, the moment you have more outlets you are able to cover bigger areas and when you cover bigger areas you will have more circulation. As a consequence of more circulation you have, therefore, more advertising.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That would be in the local field, or would that apply ---

MR. COOKE: That would apply to anything.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That would also apply to network operations?

MR. COOKE: Sure. It is academic to our whole philosophy of operation in this country. It applies to all businesses that way. The C.P.R. and the C.N.R. have the right to compete with T.C.A. and to do so all the way down the line.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But if by allowing the private stations to operate in areas where there is a C.B.C. outlet and you reduce the C.B.C.'s revenues, or if by licensing private outlets in areas not presently serviced with C.B.C. programmes, to allow them to operate in small centres ---

MR. COOKE: I have lost the thread of this already.

MR. de GRANDPRE: If you license all privately-owned stations in small centres ---

MR. COOKE: All right.

MR. de GRANDPRE:--- like Saskatoon or Lethbridge or anywhere else, it has been represented

to us that it is impossible for a commercial station to operate in a small centre without receiving the C.B.C. programmes. It has also been represented to us that in order to give those programmes to the private station, it would cost the C.B.C. some money.

MR. COOKE: Why?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Figures have been mentioned.

MR. COOKE: Why?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Kine-recordings.

MR. COOKE: Assuming that the station was not within reach of their co-axial cable or micro-wave relays so they had to make kines, well, possibly there would be some cost.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Even if it is on the micro-wave, I suggest it would cost something to the C.B.C. to give programmes to the private stations.

MR. COOKE: Yes, but does not the advertiser pay for it?

THE CHAIRMAN: Supposing it is in an area where the advertiser does not want to go?

MR. COOKE: In that case your statement would be correct.

MR. de GRANDPRE: If such a situation exists, the available money would be reduced by a similar amount to develop a national television system for Canada, and would you still feel that these private stations should be licensed at the

risk of hampering the development of a national television system?

MR. COOKE: Again, it is going to take us a long time to decide the wisdom of that statement. Of course, if you go back to the beginning of radio you can see just how valid this is. There was a national system for the distribution of radio programmes in the beginning. Therefore I cannot agree with that argument.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I thought you had already discussed the statement.

MR. COOKE: I would be very happy to quote the differences in that statement, but I cannot agree with you nor disagree with you.

MR. de GRANDPRE: On page 14 of your brief, I just want to try to make the record clear, you say:

"The C.B.C., at vast public cost,
"has monopolized all our major mar-
"kets".

And then you add:

"The C.B.C. has arbitrarily changed
"television frequency availabilities
"from market to market . . ." ?

MR. COOKE: That is right.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And then "the C.B.C. is creating a monopoly system of television broadcasting." Is it fair to say that this is the C.B.C. or would it not be fairer to say that this is the national policy?

MR. COOKE: I certainly would not know, sir. I do not think any of us will ever know. I do not know, sir. I know that in Toronto the television channel arrangements were originally that there were three VHF channels, channels 6, 9 and 11. Suddenly in 1953 Toronto was deprived of channel 11, which was required to expand in Hamilton, and channel 11, which was allocated originally to Toronto, (sic) went over to Kingston. I do not know whether that was the C.B.C. policy or the Government policy or Department of Transport policy or whose policy it was. I would suspect that this is what the C.B.C. wanted done. This is just my opinion, I do not know.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I think the point is that you have made it clear that you are saying the C.B.C. had no -- it may be the Department of Transport or it may be the Government.

MR. COOKE: It may be.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: On that same page 14 you say:

"Free enterprise pioneered radio in
"Canada at its own expense. No such
"opportunity has been given our
"citizens in the field of television."

How do you reconcile that with the statement we have heard throughout the country, there are 25 private stations and only 8 C.B.C.?

MR. COOKE: Mr. Stewart, may I say I do not know why, but in 1945 I attempted ---

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You say, no such opportunity has been given our citizens in the field of television and yet today there are 25 private stations ---

MR. COOKE: We were not allowed to pioneer, sir.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: And only 8 C.B.C. stations.

MR. COOKE: We were not allowed to pioneer.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Somebody did it.

MR. COOKE: No, sir.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Somebody would have to.

MR. COOKE: No, sir. I beg your pardon. Let us go back to 1945 when pioneering was pioneering, like the covered-wagon days. We applied for a television license in around 1948 and I made a full-scale presentation to the C.B.C. along with a technical brief and everything else, and the number of letters I have written to the C.B.C. and the Department of Transport since that time asking its permission to start operation, Mr. Stewart, so we have tried to pioneer in this field. I may say that was consistently turned down; just as consistently, as you see, as another strong request when we requested to pioneer in the field of colour television. That is what I mean by that sentence, no such opportunity has been given to our citizens in the field of television.

THE CHAIRMAN: Whatever wrong there

may have been, we cannot now satisfy your pioneering instinct.

MR. COOKE: No, sir. You can with coloured television.

THE CHAIRMAN: Am I right in thinking that you feel in the technical sphere, which you mention, the channel power, frequencies and so forth, that you recognize the need for Governmental regulation?

MR. COOKE: Yes, sir, because that comes down to international treaties between countries. There is a treaty, I think, between Cuba, Mexico, the United States and Canada. I am not sure if there are six signatories, but it does not matter anyway.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you do recognize that is what has to be done?

MR. COOKE: Absolutely.

THE CHAIRMAN: Am I also right in thinking you feel there should be Governmental regulation?

MR. COOKE: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was interested in your point on page 16 at the bottom where you say:

"This Company suggests that each television applicant in the major centres of population be asked to assure the licensing authority that a rational portion of gross revenue will be spent each year in

"the employment of live Canadian
"talent."

Is that not regulation?

MR. COOKE: I would not think so. I think it is more in the form of "subject to getting a television license".

THE CHAIRMAN: It is still regulation where you write that into the regulations.

MR. COOKE: I would say yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just let us pursue that. I was not trying to make a big point there.

MR. COOKE: No, I wouldn't think so.

THE CHAIRMAN: What I am interested in is this suggestion because it has never been presented to us before. You think that in some way, through licenses or through regulation -- or how is that to be brought about? It would be a reasonable provision to attach to those licenses or whatever you like to call them ---

MR. COOKE: I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: --- to have a requirement that there would be a certain proportion of live Canadian talent?

MR. COOKE: A certain portion of money out of the gross revenue spent on live talent. I see nothing terribly wrong with that, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now turning to page 21 of your brief, the last paragraph, there is a suggestion there which reads as follows:

"A more intelligent operation in

"the economic sense, I submit, would
"be to transform the C.B.C. into a
"production centre for programmes
"of national import and of particular
"interest to various minority groups,
"which could then be carried through
"the length and breadth of the
"country by the private networks."

Can you expand a little on this suggestion?

MR. COOKE: Much the same as the National Film Board's function. They do not only go to theatres, that I am aware of. They produce these programmes, these films. Some of them are awfully good and they arrange with publishers of this entertainment media, the theatres, to put on these National Film Board documentaries or shorts and, I suppose, of one kind or another.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But the National Film Board does not have the responsibility of carrying on a national film service.

MR. COOKE: I know that, sir. But this is taking into consideration that the laws of the land are changed slightly to allow this, obviously.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is what I wanted to get at. If you take all the several elements of your brief, do we not get the impression that you are against a national broadcasting system as such?

MR. COOKE: I may not be in favour of it. That does not mean to say I am against it,

does it?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is true that in the National Film Board operation you have a very different kind of outlet for your products. I mean, you have commercial theatres which carry some of it and a great deal of the National Film Board production does go out on 16 millimetre film which can be played throughout the country.

MR. COOKE: Quite.

THE CHAIRMAN: The analogy is not too close.

MR. COOKE: I should think so. I have often wondered whether the C.B.C. at times were not treading on the toes of the National Film Board, and whether the National Film Board were not at times treading on the toes of the C.B.C. I think it is more than an analogy. I think there is striking competition at times between the two of them.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would think that was good.

MR. COOKE: I think so. The thing I am trying to clarify is the difference to the lack of analogy. I do not think they are necessarily analogous. I think they are at times actually competing. I think that is a healthy thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: My point is this: Where you have a vehicle for conveying a product such as you have in film, where you have many centres and probably not the majority of centres have a 16 millimetre projector. You can develop

this film and run it at any time you like. There would seem to be a great difference between the two.

MR. COOKE : Except that, let us take the other aspect now. You have theatres which are more jealous of the time that they have at their disposal than the telecasting stations are, and yet the theatres devote a great -- a fairly decent portion of their time to the National Film Board's films. There is no reason whatever why there should not be even more competition between the two of them following along the line we have just developed, rather than by having the C.B.C. produce their shows and put them on 16 millimetre film, which is the most economical way for them to do anything -- if they would allow its use by private television stations, or maybe make them available to the various cultural clubs and charitable organizations and so on all the way down the line, there would not be too much duplication of function then.

(Page 3117 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: There are some serious problems in connection with that.

MR. COOKE: I know nothing is ever as simple as it sounds.

MR. de GRANDPRE: On page 22 you say that the C.B.C. was created to protect Canadian culture, and in the next paragraph you open with this sentence:

"But in practice no real effort, even
"by the State organization, was made
"to produce these results."

Why do you come to this conclusion? We have heard representations which ---

MR. COOKE: Oh well, you will excuse me, but what you have done is not entirely fair. Let us read what you have just read part of. May I?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Oh, certainly.

MR. COOKE: "Instead, however, the C.B.C.,
"a creature of the State, was appointed
"to protect Canadian culture and hold
"back the flood of Americanism."

That is awfully important, is it not?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Yes. I am trying to be as fair as possible.

MR. COOKE: Oh, I know that, I know that. This is just me:

"But in practice no real effort, even
"by the State organization, was made
"to produce these results."

I think this gets back to what we talked about

the reluctant alliance with the sponsors and so on, most of whom were sending in their American programmes, the soap operas and so on. We had a tremendous number of American programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to have the exact meaning of the words you used and we will read them again:

"Instead, however, the C.B.C.,
"a creature of the State, was
"appointed to protect Canadian
"culture and hold back the flood
"of Americanism. But in practice
"no real effort, even by the State
"organization, was made to produce
"these results."

Do you mean by that that no real effort was made by the C.B.C. to protect Canadian culture?

MR. COOKE: I mean by that precisely this: that in practice no real effort was made by the C.B.C. to hold back the flood of Americanism and to protect Canadian culture.

THE CHAIRMAN: The only reason for raising the issue by Mr. de Grandpre or myself is that now we have had quite a number of organizations come before us who have said that the C.B.C. has done something to improve Canadian culture and has done something to hold back the flood of Americanism.

MR. COOKE: Here we go again; what do we mean by "Canadian culture"?

THE CHAIRMAN: We have had that defined in different places but in a fairly broad way.

MR. COOKE: Acceptable definition to you?

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not accepting any definition.

MR. COOKE: No, you read T.S. Elliot's Notes on Definition of Culture, and then you will be as truly vague as I am about it. In one part he says in England, culture in England is the test matches at Lords ---

THE CHAIRMAN: That was not precisely the point that was made by the University of British Columbia when they said that Barbara Ann Scott and Rocket Richard were as much part of the Canadian culture as Sir Ernest McMillan.

MR. COOKE: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would subscribe to that?

MR. COOKE: Very strongly.

THE CHAIRMAN: But even subscribing to that you feel the State organization has not done---

MR. COOKE: Let us get it right. You know what I mean -- I won't say that on that basis that cannot -- perhaps there has been a slight ebullience entered into.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will accept that.

MR. COOKE: The ebullience that I hope you can understand, Mr. Fowler.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is a poor writer

who does not have some purple passages.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Then you make some comments on the independent regulatory controlling body and I am going to read inextenso:

"We have also submitted that a
"Canadian Broadcasting Corporation,
"sustained by public funds, should
"be limited to the following func-
"tions:

"(a) Production of programmes
"of genuine national importance.

"(b) Production of minority
"programming which free enterprise
"cannot afford.

"(c) Distribution of adequate
"programme service in our sparsely-
"populated areas."

I can hardly reconcile the first suggestion with the previous remarks of your brief because who would be the judge to say that a production is of genuine national importance? You leave that to the C.B.C.?

MR. COOKE: That has always been the difficulty in all of these things, who is wise enough to decide all of these things? None of us. The net result: friction somewhere, sometimes among the majority, sometimes among the minorities.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is why I cannot understand why you are making this recommendation at the end.

MR. COOKE: It has been so difficult to

try and speak to you gentlemen of what may be the most over-generous blueprint on this thing; it is not an easy thing to do, it is the sort of thing that only evolution will take care of, it is going to develop and to try to put it all down here is impossible and I had to do the best I could.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it fair to summarize this last part of your brief to say that the functions of the C.B.C. should be mainly in the programming of national importance, mainly in the programme-producing end of the thing; and you are, in fact, saying that an independent regulatory control board is therefore unnecessary? I may have read this too hurriedly.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Except from the technical aspects?

MR. COOKE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Except from the technical aspects?

MR. COOKE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You do not feel the independently-controlled board as it has been requested in other briefs, is needed for the control of programme content?

MR. COOKE: No, sir; emphatically no.

THE CHAIRMAN: Or the development of Canadian broadcasting itself?

MR. COOKE: No, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Well, there is a last question I would like to ask you; it does not arise

out of your brief, but I am putting to you because you are an experienced broadcaster.

MR. COOKE: I have not done anything in that direction for about 5 years.

MR. de GRANDPRE: In your opinion, what will be the impact of television on radio? Do you feel that radio will survive in its present form and position?

MR. COOKE: Yes, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You do?

MR. COOKE: It is easily answered, yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: You do not feel, in other words, that television is going to crowd radio out of the Canadian scene?

MR. COOKE: Television has taken some of the nighttime audience from radio because that is when it is more attractive to the average viewer, but I think the majority of the larger stations in Canada are doing as well or better than they have ever done, and we have now had television in Canada for three or four years.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, apart from what it has done to the radio operators, look at it from the standpoint of the Canadian people: Would you say that television has a service -- that radio has a continuing service to perform?

MR. COOKE: Oh, positively.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: And it will survive, even on nighttime audiences?

MR. COOKE: Yes, we broadcast 24 hours

a day and we expect to continue it.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: And your listening audience has not been too badly affected?

MR. COOKE: No, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is all, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sorry we kept you so late.

MR. COOKE: It was a very real pleasure, thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn now until 10.00 o'clock tomorrow morning.

---The hearings adjourned at 6.25 P.M. until 10.00 A.M. Tuesday, June 5, 1956.

I N D E X

JUNE 4, 1956

<u>SUBMISSIONS BY:</u>		<u>Page</u>
ASSOCIATION OF CANADIAN ADVERTISERS	...	2904
Mr. Peter Wright, Q.C.		
Mr. R. McIntosh.		
THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS OF CANADA	...	3051
Mr. J.S. Angevine.		
Mr. S.C. Symington.		
Mr. Donald McGregor.		
Mr. E.D. McDonald.		
Mr. R.C. Rae.		
Mr. H.A. Ward.		
TORONTO BROADCASTING COMPANY LIMITED (CKEY)	...	3066
Mr. Jack Kent Cooke		

INDEX TO EXHIBITS

<u>No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
121	Brief of Association of Canadian Advertisers.	2907
122	Brief of Young Men's Christian Association.	3051
123	Brief of Toronto Broadcasting Company Limited (CKEY)	3067

ROYAL COMMISSION
ON
BROADCASTING

HEARINGS

HELD AT

TORONTO, ONT.

June 5, 1956

v. 19

I N D E X

JUNE 5, 1956.

<u>SUBMISSIONS BY:</u>		<u>Page</u>
L'ALLIANCE CANADIENNE	...	3124
Mrs. V. Price		
Mr. Albert St. Jean		
Dr. Gordon Bates		
CANADIAN GIRL GUIDES ASSOCIATION	...	3146
Mrs. R. Nesbitt		
Mrs. D.E.S. Wishart		
'VISITES INTERPROVINCIALES'	...	3158
Mr. J.H. Biggar, Director.		
THE WOMEN'S INTER-CHURCH COUNCIL OF CANADA.	...	3165
Mrs. P.K. Hambly.		
Mrs. J.L. Halpenny		
LABOR-PROGRESSIVE PARTY	...	3187
Mr. John Stewart		
Mr. Charles Sims		
THE LUTHERAN HOUR	...	3224
Rev. Horace H. Erdman		
Rev. C.T. Wetzstein		
THE NURSERY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO.	...	3236
Miss Ethel Stevens		
Mrs. William Foster		
Miss Margaret Fletcher		
THE CANADIAN TEMPERANCE FEDERATION	...	3250
Rev. John Linton		
MR. BEN NOBLEMAN (Private Submissio)	...	3267

INDEX TO EXHIBITS

<u>No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
124	Brief of L'Alliance Canadienne.	3125
125	Brief of Canadian Girl Guides Association.	3146
126	Brief of 'Visites Interprovinciales'	3158
127	Brief of Women's Inter-Church Council of Canada.	3165
128	Brief of the Labor-Progressive Party.	3187
129	Brief of The Lutheran Hour	3225
130	Brief of The Nursery Education Association of Ontario.	3237
131	Brief of The Canadian Temperance Federation.	3250
132	Private submission of Mr. Ben Nobleman	3267

TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1956

SUBMISSIONS BY:

L'ALLIANCE CANADIENNE

Mrs. V. Price, President
Albert St. Jean, Vice-President
Dr. Gordon Bates, Past President

CANADIAN GIRL GUIDES ASSOCIATION

Mrs. R. Nesbitt
Mrs. D. E. S. Wishart

VISITES INTERPROVINCIALES

Mr. J. H. Biggar, Director

WOMEN'S INTER-CHURCH COUNCIL OF CANADA

Mrs. P. K. Hambly, President
Mrs. J. L. Halpenny

LABOR-PROGRESSIVE PARTY

Mr. Chas Sims

THE LUTHERAN HOUR (Kitchener, Ont.)

Rev. Horace H. Erdman
Rev. C. T. Wetzstein

NURSERY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO

Miss Ethel Stevens
Mrs. Wm. Foster
Miss Margaret Fletcher

CANADIAN TEMPERANCE FEDERATION

Rev. John Linton

- - - - -

---On resume at 10.00 a.m.

- - - - -

SUBMISSION OF L'ALLIANCE CANADIENNE

Appearances:

Mrs. V. Price
Mr. Albert St. Jean
Dr. Gordon Bates

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we will now
open the session for today's hearing. There are a

number of briefs to be heard, the first being from L'Alliance Canadienne, which will be presented by Mrs. V. Price, assisted by Mr. Albert St. Jean and Dr. Gordon Bates. Would you mind coming up to these seats, please?

Mrs. Price, the procedure here is very informal. You may either read the brief verbatim or speak to it and hit the highlights, so to speak; after that there will be questions by our counsel and by the Commission. It is a matter of trying to bring out all the facts, that is what the questions are directed toward. They do not represent any opinion that has been formed or indicate such, so if we may we will begin by marking your brief as Exhibit 124.

EXHIBIT NO. 124: Brief of L'Alliance Canadienne.

THE CHAIRMAN: And will you present it as you see fit?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, we as representatives of L'Alliance Canadienne deem it a great opportunity to present our brief to you. With your permission I would like to summarize just a bit, and then perhaps read from two or three sections, the parts which I think clarify what we have in mind.

The first page of our brief tells of the formation of L'Alliance Canadienne, how it began about three years ago when a group, a small group of interested citizens in Toronto felt there was a great need to further the understanding between

our two peoples, the people of the English and French language; and to increase the appreciation each of the other in its culture, and so strengthen the possibilities and potentialities of Canada.

We found a very lively response to this movement, and when I say that our membership in the organization, which now is going along in Toronto, includes educationists, doctors, lawyers, business men and women, people interested in the arts, public relations officers, translators, editors, authors, and both Protestant and Catholic clergy, you will see we cover a very representative group of people. At the same time, I want to stress that we are in no way exclusive. We find that the interest extends to all branches of society, and of course I do not need to say at all that L'Alliance Canadienne is a voluntary and non-profit organization.

We have a very active section now going in Quebec and another one is forming in Ottawa. We expect one to be established in London very soon, and we have had inquiries from as far west as Winnipeg.

The second page of our brief speaks of the needs for this type of movement, and the fact that a French-language service is lacking in English speaking areas in Canada. We mention, of course, the city of Toronto and the province of Ontario. We know that briefs concerning this have already been given by the schools and by the University of Toronto, and we express our support of those,

but L'Alliance Canadienne itself represents a very different group of people. It is not those who are in education or continuing education, rather it is the established citizens, those who have had French in school, those who have improved it by visits abroad, and then they come back to the English-speaking area like this, settle into everyday life, and there is no opportunity to hear the language, there is no opportunity to practise it, and then there is a great feeling of frustration among the English-speaking citizens who really want to do something about it and feel they are not only supplying a need for themselves but they are building something that is helpful in our country.

We can always read French, that is true, but it is the living language that is a very necessary thing we feel.

On the third page, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we give three brief reasons why we think there is a very growing interest for this need for better understanding of the French language by our English-speaking Canadians, and with your permission, Mr. Chairman, since these are very brief, may I read them? There are many reasons for this growing interest; we mention only three:

"(1) A definite realization of the importance and responsibility of English-speaking Canadians having a better understanding of their French-speaking compatriots.

"(2) The ever-increasing number of

people who have come to Canada from European lands, and the resultant wider use of languages. Many Europeans have more knowledge of French than of English, and the English-speaking Canadian who can speak French to these new Canadians helps build the understanding and friendship so necessary in our rapidly growing country.

"(3) Toronto is becoming a city and port of international importance. This international quality or character would be greatly enhanced and benefited, if the French language were as easily available through the medium of radio, as is the English language. To meet this international challenge, and to develop a quality which is beyond the local and provincial, it is necessary to make bilingualism a practical and working actuality."

After those three reasons, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we feel that the CBC is in a unique position to render further public service, and on page 4 we make certain recommendations. Again, I think it would be wise if I read these directly. First of all, I should say that we realize that the present French network covers the areas where it has a concentrated French-speaking people, and we now want this to go to the English-speaking citizens.

We suggest that the growth of TV, as a means of mass entertainment has freed radio so that

it may undertake various educational and cultural projects which formerly, we understand, the available time did not permit. Among such projects there might be included a variety of programmes in French. The readiness of a Toronto audience to accept something worth while produced in the French language was strikingly illustrated by the sell-out audiences for the Comedie Francaise in October, 1955.

L'Alliance Canadienne would suggest that now is the opportune time for CBC to schedule certain programmes in French which hitherto might have been unacceptable to a mass radio audience.

L'Alliance Canadienne would like also to urge that a broadcasting transmitter -- I should say an unmanned transmitter -- be set up in the Toronto area, to act as a repeater station for French programmes, in a manner similar to that by which radio coverage is given in the mountainous areas of British Columbia.

We express appreciation for those programmes that exist, mentioning the Concert Hour. We are glad recently a new one has come up speaking French, coming on Saturday afternoon, and in conclusion in our brief, gentlemen, we express two hopes:

We hope ways and means may be found to develop more and more programmes that, first, employ radio more extensively to bring French language within the reach of English-speaking listeners of the Toronto area, and secondly, employ both radio and television to help remove prejudice by increasing

knowledge and understanding between French and English-speaking citizens.

I think, Mr. Chairman, these hopes place the desires of L'Alliance Canadienne on a very high level, and while they speak for an individual need, they also represent a strong desire for national unity and for the opportunity for a substantial number of our citizens to become bilingual; thus making bilingualism an actuality rather than a theory. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mrs. Price.

MRS. PRICE: I would like very much, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if the other two representatives might speak to this brief. May I present our Vice-President, Mr. Albert St. Jean.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. St. Jean, we will be very pleased to hear a word from you. I discussed with Mrs. Price whether we would ask you to speak in French or English. If you spoke in French I think we would understand you, but we haven't French reporters here, so if you would do it in English I would appreciate it.

MR. ST. JEAN: I have changed my mind, I have written my little note in French, but I have written them in English this morning, so I give you this, Mr. Chairman, in English, in my English which is not maybe as bright as Mrs. Price's.

I have lived in Toronto for the last seven years. During this period of time I have noted two main factors which indicate a need for a

relay of French radio programmes. (a) An interest shown by the English-speaking people of this city for the French language and traditions and folk lore, literature, and so forth; (b) deeply felt regret for lack of opportunity to learn more about French language and traditions. In our mind is a closer association of the two most important ethnic groups living in Canada. This trend has given birth in 1953 to the establishment of L'Alliance Canadienne which was to promote a better understanding among all Canadians.

Since its inception three sub-groups have been at work to compare the two cultures, to promote study of French, and to learn about literature of both groups. L'Alliance Canadienne has organized night classes in French conversation which have proved popular and successful. From these various contacts we have obtained the conviction that a great many Torontonians are eager to hear and speak French for a practical reason, and also to keep up that which they have learned during their five years of high school. However, this very valuable desire is frustrated since hardly any French radio programmes can be heard here.

It is felt that the present situation tends to establish a gap between the two groups, which, we regret to say, is not favourable to Canadian unity.

We sincerely think the CBC would render a great service to all Canadians in making it possible

to hear in Toronto broadcasts in the French language. We are all anxious to see a greater Canada, a united country. Broadcasts in French in Toronto would materially change the atmosphere and clear a lot of suspicious ideas.

May I place before the honourable members of the Royal Commission on inquiry in radio for their consideration and action a strong request of L'Alliance Canadienne for daily French radio programmes? This powerful means of intercommunication, it is hoped, will strengthen the foundation of a greater and more united Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. Dr. Bates, I had the pleasure of hearing you briefly last week. We know how you feel about these matters. Have you anything to add at the present time?

DR. BATES: Mr. Chairman, I feel I am here a little bit under false pretences, for I announced I would not be here last week, but I find in Ottawa they won't talk about anything but pipelines.

THE CHAIRMAN: We won't talk about that here.

DR. BATES: I am glad to be here. I want to endorse everything that Mrs. Price and Mr. St. Jean have said. There is a very, very large group here in Toronto who really want to do something about the French language, and they are completely frustrated because of lack of practice, and one of the great factors that could improve that is radio broadcast.

One thing which has just struck me, in

our estimate there are probably two hundred thousand people in Toronto who studied French and who cannot speak it. Now, the universities might well have pointed out the fact of economic waste. "Why should we spend so much money on teaching them to speak French if they are going to forget it?"

All I can say is that I fully endorse everything that has been said here this morning.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Dr. Bates.

MR. COYNE: Mrs. Price, can you give us some figures as to the number of members in L'Alliance Canadienne in Toronto?

MRS. PRICE: In our branch here, Mr. Commissioner, we have about 150 members. They are between 150 and 200 in Quebec City. What the membership will be in Ottawa I cannot tell you.

MR. COYNE: Mr. St. Jean mentioned that you have held night classes in French. I suppose through such night classes and perhaps other activities you reach directly to a larger number of people than your own membership? Can you give us any indication as to the number of people who have taken part in your night classes or whom you reach in any other way?

MRS. PRICE: Actually in fact, Mr. Commissioner, we have not endeavoured to reach a large group of people. Instead, we have formed classes on different levels of teaching. We have taken those people, older people who have forgotten their French completely, but they want to revive

it, and we start those in a beginners' group; and we have another one, where people can carry on fairly well in conversation, and we have formed a group for those; and then, for those people who still retain their French and speak well conversationally, we have one for those. But again, it was not numbers, it was to find people scattered through the city who felt they could come into the group and find the level that they needed.

We have reached larger numbers -- those groups that I spoke of, probably, we will say thirty to a group -- larger groups have come in for our soirees, and I would like both Mr. St. Jean and Dr. Bates to speak for a moment to those if they will because Mr. St. Jean has one group and Dr. Bates another.

Mr. St. Jean, will you tell a bit of the soirees that you have been holding?

MR. ST. JEAN: I have in my home what I call a petit salon. It is a group of about sixty people who meet in my home every month. The purpose of this is to let the French people know about the literature of the English Canadian. Or, for instance, one month we will have a talk in English by one English Canadian from Toronto here, who will speak, let us say, on one author or one poem or one writer or one newspaper man, something like that. And the next month we will have a French Canadian give a talk on one of our French Canadian writers.

The purpose of this is to show the French

Canadians to the English Canadians, and English Canadians to the French Canadians, so that they know each other.

We have done this for about three years now, and the group is almost the same, with a slight increase. We have seen people changing their attitude, and becoming more interested and more friendly together, so we figure this is a good way to have people mix and understand better. That is what I am doing in my petit salon.

MRS. PRICE: Dr. Bates, would you be good enough to speak about yours?

DR. BATES: Mr. Chairman, I am chairman of a sub-committee which has to do with study and reasons which create a situation, and I am trying to describe that a large number of people cannot speak French, and we are trying to correct that as much as we can. We would like to see French in primary schools, for example. We would like to see more emphasis on spoken French than on written French and so on.

This question of the classes, we have more or less grown out of that, because we realize one of the things is lack of opportunity to continue their French, and therefore an attempt was made to see whether people would go to classes. I point out we are an Association with no paid officers. It is entirely voluntary. We simply give our time to this, and therefore when it comes to attracting large numbers to the classes, we simply cannot do it.

If we were able to improve our class -- on the occasion of one social evening where there were one hundred or two hundred people present, the announcement was made we would like to know, we would like people who were interested to come to meetings; out of that comparatively small meeting, twenty-four people turned up. I believe if these methods of propaganda were utilized throughout the city we would find a great many adults who have some knowledge of French who would like to take advantage of opportunities of that kind. I think we are sort of a proving organization.

We are trying to prove a fact we feel in our own minds is true, that there is a very great interest in the French language among the English-speaking people in Canada.

MR. COYNE: I suppose you have no way of measuring or judging the real extent of this interest or the extent to which a French-language radio outlet would in fact be listened to?

DR. BATES: I play golf with people -- I played golf with a graduate in modern languages the other day. He said, "Why did I waste my time studying French for four years and now I am forgetting it?" My friends in the Rotary Club, I hear the same story there on all sides. I get individual stories, but how under the sun to get a discovery to answer your question, I don't know. We have a feeling it is very widespread.

MR. COYNE: This is a feeling you get in

your contacts?

DR. BATES: Yes. I have in my own work -- I address a good many home and school clubs. During this winter I have taken the opportunity of discussing it, the matter in general, with home and school club executives. I find invariably in my experience these people who generally represent all classes of society, I suppose, because most schools have home and school clubs, -- they invariably say, "We would like to have something done. We would like our children to have the thing we missed."

MRS. PRICE: May I speak just a moment to that? As Dr. Bates has said, it is only through our contacts that we can form ideas on this, and as our membership is as representative as it is, we do reach a considerable number of people or widespread group of people who seem enthusiastic. But if one were to say that you are reaching more those who are interested in education and those who are intellectuals and so on, I do not think that necessarily follows.

One thing which brought this home to me a few months ago was when I had a visitor from Quebec and she stayed with me some time, and went around Toronto a good deal. Her English was quite good, but when we went into shops down town, large or small, and she would be making a purchase, she would speak in English and then perhaps feel she had not just got across the idea, turned to me in French and I would try to reply to her. Almost

invariably the clerk behind the counter would say, "How wonderful you can speak both languages. I wish I could speak French."

To me that was very indicative. We scarcely ever went into a shop and made a purchase that that did not happen, and that was something that was completely spontaneous.

MR. COYNE: Well then, turning to your recommendations on page 4, Mrs. Price, of your brief, where you mention the role which radio can now play as a result of the advent of TV, just to make sure we are clear as to the point: is it this, that now that television has become the medium for mass entertainment you feel that the English-speaking radio could now be used to broadcast programmes in French, which before the advent of TV would not have been acceptable to the mass audience that was listening to radio at that time?

MRS. PRICE: I made inquiry, Mr. Commissioner, from some of the experts in radio as to what our possibilities were, and the understanding I got was that there is -- that radio has been freed by this mass onslaught of TV, and therefore it should be easier for radio to produce these programmes which it could not do before.

MR. COYNE: You are not suggesting that there be broadcasts of French programmes on the English-speaking television network?

MRS. PRICE: I think broadcasts on the English-speaking television network would be excellent,

but we have particularly in mind the English radio network.

MR. COYNE: But might it not be true if television now attracts mass audience that French programmes might be unacceptable to the people in so far as it interfered with the English programme they are used to seeing on television?

MRS. PRICE: I do not think I can say it would be -- what was the word?

MR. COYNE: Unacceptable.

MRS. PRICE: That it would be unacceptable. I do not like to use that term, Mr. Commissioner, because I think interest has grown so greatly that perhaps the attitude has changed a good deal and there would not be that feeling. :

DR. BATES: There was one point, I was down in Montreal a couple of weeks ago, and in the hotel I listened to a French television programme, and the thing which I realized was this, if it is a matter of learning French, television is far better than a radio broadcast because the action suited the words. There is every reason to believe that television is a better means if you are thinking of people retaining a knowledge or learning French.

MR. COYNE: But the point that was made I think by the University Department of French in advocating a repeater station for the French network in Toronto was that in that way French radio programmes might be made available to the people of Toronto without having to interfere with any English-

speaking programmes which audiences may now be listening to.

DR. BATES: I am just wondering how far we can go. This is a point very well taken.

-

-

-

(Page 3141 follows)

-

-

-

MR. COYNE: Those are all the questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, just on that point, the evidence you have given and other groups have given about the interest in French in this area is quite impressive, but when you add it all up it is still a total number which makes up a minority group, does it not?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, I think it is true, but also is it not true that since its inception CBC has tried to produce for the minority groups?

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no question about that, there is nothing wrong about a minority group, but arising from Mr. Coyne's question there has to be some choice made between the various groups who are interested in various types of programmes, and this is particularly difficult in television where you have a particularly expensive medium and a limited number of outlets.

MRS. PRICE: I think we in L'Alliance Canadienne feel if the radio programmes became available, if it went on further and TV was available you would not only have the cake but the icing too.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the thing that interests me personally is the way in which this interest in bilingualism is growing. I was quite interested out west, having been on a somewhat similar trip about the country almost exactly twenty years ago, to find that this time we had six or eight briefs presented in French throughout the West, when twenty

years ago we did not have any. I am particularly interested to hear that this interest has developed in Toronto. Can you tell me how it came about; is it the growth of education or what made Toronto suddenly become interested in French?

MRS. PRICE: I think it is the trend of the times. Since the war there has been a tremendous influx of European peoples to our country and with them French is more the second language than English. Our own French-speaking Canadians have moved across the country very widely. I think also the effect of industrialization has had a very important effect, businesses now require men and women who speak both languages and I think the needs across our country have built up this desire.

Quite apart from those we are thinking of it as, I suppose, the ordinary citizen who just wishes to continue with his French language which he has learned to like and wanted to use after school and university.

DR. BATES: I do not agree entirely with Mrs. Price, I do not think the influx of Europeans has had much to do with it. I think there has been a very large potential right along and it required some person or persons to come along and exploit it. L'Alliance Canadienne have taken that position. I think people have got a little bit tired of this vague type of bon entente, I do not think you can have that without both languages.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You suggest, Mrs.

Price, in your brief that a transmitter be set up in the Toronto area; have you at any time approached the CBC in that respect?

MRS. PRICE: I could not say I approached the CBC, I have approached people who knew about radio and about broadcasting, and the question that I put was, in each case, what would be the most reasonable approach for getting French radio programmes on the English network, and I was told that this station which now takes French programmes past Toronto, which, I think, is in Brantford or near Brantford, with what is called a low power radio transmitter, that would be the most inexpensive method of doing it, and that was what my idea was.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: I understand this little station, or booster station, has very low power and does not transmit very far.

MRS. PRICE: I asked that question, too, and was told it should have a radius of thirty to forty miles.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: I was told about ten.

MRS. PRICE: Well, I do think this person should know, these persons should know to whom I spoke.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dunton, what sort of radius has it?

MR. DUNTON: Speaking of the transmitters as used on the network, they will do around ten miles in an area where there is no interference.

Such a thing would be useless in Toronto. The minimum power would have to be 250 watts, and we do not know if a frequency could be found for that; if it were found it would be subject to heavy interference. If one was found the minimum would still be 250 watts and then would not cover the whole metropolitan area.

MRS. PRICE: And this possibility of the station at Brantford for thirty to forty miles is not possible?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think if you used a heavy transmitter ---

MRS. PRICE: If you used the unmanned transmitter?

MR. DUNTON: We could use a 250 watt transmitter that would be unmanned; unfortunately we do not know of a French station at Brantford, the programme would have to be brought from Quebec.

MRS. PRICE: Does it not go to Winnipeg via Brantford or near Brantford?

MR. DUNTON: No, it goes through Northern Ontario.

MRS. PRICE: I am sorry, I was wrongly informed.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think with these various briefs we will want to hear the CBC in the fall as to what the whole picture is on this French-speaking station in Toronto.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: But if the relay station were impossible, do you still feel there

would be a possibility of scheduling certain programmes on the English network a few hours a day or a week; do you think that would be acceptable, to use Mr. Coyne's word?

MRS. PRICE: I think so; we should be very delighted indeed to have it.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Do you think it would be generally accepted by the population even by the non-listening public, they would not miss anything, those who would be interested in listening in would have it and others would not care whether the time was taken from their other programmes?

MRS. PRICE: I do not see why it should not work just as it does with other phases of production. Many people do not like jazz but there are good jazz programmes; many do not like opera but there are good opera programmes, and why should we not go in in the same way -- there are so many programmes available.

DR. BATES: I am not at all certain that a straight French broadcasting station in Toronto might not get considerable public support.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Straight what?

DR. BATES: French broadcasting station in Toronto.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, you will readily appreciate there are technical problems as to whether or not wave lengths are available, the amount of power and other interference, and we must consider the overall cost of such a thing, because I do not think there will be much argument anywhere as to the

desirability of it. It is a question of whether it is a practical matter to be added to the present costs of the CBC, which have been mounting very rapidly and which have caused a great deal of concern to a great many people. This is the problem, it is not the question of the desirability of the thing, it is the question of how it comes in the sort of order of priority of costs. I think, Mr. Dunton, we will want to go into this in the fall in our re-examination of the CBC. Thank you very much indeed.

- - - - -

SUBMISSION OF
CANADIAN GIRL GUIDES ASSOCIATION

Appearances: :

Mrs. R. Nesbitt

Mrs. D. E. S. Wishart

- - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Nesbitt, I believe, is to present the brief?

MRS. NESBITT: Yes, Mrs. Hyde is not able to be here, but I have with me Mrs. Wishart.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have seen your brief and it is very short, and it may be you would want to read it. We will mark your brief as Exhibit No.125.

EXHIBIT NO. 125: Brief of Canadian Girl Guides Association.

MRS. NESBITT: "Mr. Chairman and honourable gentlemen, it is a great pleasure to

present this brief on behalf of the Canadian Girl Guides Association.

"Girl Guiding offers a programme of training and citizenship for girls. Like the Boy Scout Movement, it was the inspiration of Lord Baden-Powell. His vision created a way of life intended to develop the finest characteristics in young people, irrespective of colour, creed or race. To them he brought a very special way of enjoying life, encouraging the spirit of adventure, the love of nature and a deep appreciation of the wonders of God. We hope television will play as large a part in promoting our programme for the youth of Canada as radio has done and is doing.

"Our programme includes training in crafts and skills which foster creativeness and encourage the girls to become good homemakers and capable citizens. Emphasis is laid on camping and out-of-door activities; healthy, adventurous recreation, which develops initiative, self-reliance, resourcefulness and the power of observation.

"The Movement is non-denominational, non-political and co-operates with other educational organizations. Its leadership is entirely voluntary and all adult members give their time freely and gladly. The amazing growth of the Girl Guides Association during the last half century is proof of its tremendous

vitality and the exceptional appeal it makes to young girls. In Canada there are 130,000 members.

"In order to prepare this brief, we asked our representatives in all ten provinces for information about the use of radio and television. All were enthusiastic about the help given them by the CBC and private radio stations. Naturally, an organization such as ours cannot pay for the time we receive. Therefore it is a gift from the various stations which we appreciate very much. The following are excerpts from the opinions received:

From the Maritimes: 'We have many reasons to be thankful for the help we have received from radio and television. . . . the radio and TV stations are most helpful and co-operative; the CBC station gives the Guides a fifteen-minute programme twice a month; the local radio station is most co-operative and public spirited.'

From the West: 'We do receive wonderful co-operation from our stations; the television network has co-operated with us whenever they have been asked.' 'The Boy Scouts and Girl Guides have a five minute programme every Saturday night.' 'Two stations made tape recordings of talks by the World Chief Guide, Lady Baden-Powell. Both gave the tapes to the Girl Guides to be played in other parts

of Canada.' Ontario and Quebec report equal co-operation and help.

"The following suggestions are the ones we want to make:

- a) The time on radio or television is a gift, and therefore we are very often called at the last minute without sufficient time to prepare the Guides who are to participate. More time for preparation would benefit both the Guides and the station producing the programme.
- b) When a programme is prepared for presentation by a member of our Association, technical assistance is required in order to present it to best advantage.
- c) When Guide activities are televised, perhaps the films might be given or lent to us so that they might be shown to Guides who are far away from big centres and have not an opportunity of seeing the programmes.
- d) TV seems the perfect medium for informing the public about Guide activities. Perhaps shorts could be made on such subjects as pioneer camping, woodcraft, homemaking or other aspects of the Guide programme.

"The Canadian Girl Guides Association wishes to thank the CBC and private radio stations in Canada for the wonderful co-operation received in the past, and hope that in the future we will continue to enjoy this co-operation."

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mrs. Nesbitt. Mrs. Wishart, have you anything to add?

MRS. WISHART: No, I would just like to endorse this brief, because we could not possibly pay for any of the time we get and the stations are wonderful to us. I do want to stress again that all our leadership is voluntary and therefore the time they give, it is rather nice that an organization like the CBC and the private stations appreciate that and help all they can.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. de Grandpre?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Mrs. Nesbitt, could you tell us what kind of programmes you are preparing or you are asked to put on television for CBC?

MRS. NESBITT: For CBC, most of our -- did you say television?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Well, I understand you are preparing some programmes for television?

MRS. NESBITT: Most of that is done locally, of course, because we are a very widespread organization, our publicity on radio and television is nearly all local because things that go on are of interest locally. It would be a five-minute news programme of what the local Guides and Scouts are doing, or perhaps news of something that may be going on, special events such as a rally or something like that, or perhaps an interview with someone visiting such as Lady Baden-Powell.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Have you been asked by radio or television stations, whether private or

public, to put on programmes relating to camping and outdoor life and teenagers activities and programmes of this nature?

MRS. NESBITT: No, we have not been asked on a national basis, have we, Mrs. Wishart?

MRS. WISHART: No, but we hope we are going to be asked and therefore we are preparing. We think definitely the early life of Lady Baden-Powell would be just as interesting as some other things they are putting on for the teenagers.

THE CHAIRMAN: As interesting as the life of Davy Crockett?

MRS. WISHART: More so, we think, and we think our camping is second to none, and we can help a lot of the camping associations by showing them how to do it because we really camp that way.

MR. de GRANDPRE: How many programmes a month could the Guides prepare?

MRS. NESBITT: You mean nationally?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Yes, probably nationally, if it is simpler. I do not know; I am asking questions because I do not know whether it would be easier for the Guides to prepare these programmes on a local basis or a national basis.

MRS. NESBITT: I think it falls into two categories, really. The local broadcasters broadcasts are the kind which I mentioned, which are news and are of interest to the Guides in the community. The national ones, which we have never been asked to do yet, would be interpreting our

Guiding to the public and in that way would be of help to us in getting adult leaders for the movement.

MR. de GRANDPRE: On a national basis how many programmes would you prepare each month or every three months? Did you ever give thought to the problem if you were to be asked?

MRS. NESBITT: Have we ever planned anything?

MRS. WISHART: May I speak to that? We do have a radio programme that went on every week, it was paid for by a certain firm but used us as a means of advertising, which was awfully good of them, we thought. It took quite a lot of time but we did it. At any rate, in the brief we say if we were asked we would be given time because we are amateurs, we have not the material; we have the subject matter but we would need help in preparing it, so it could be acceptable over a station, it would be up to the standard of a station. We could get the material and I think we could prepare a programme a month if we were asked.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And from past experience I gather you have no objection if the programme was sponsored?

MRS. NESBITT: No, none at all.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, you say that when Guide activities are televised perhaps the films might be loaned or given to you. Have you ever asked?

MRS. NESBITT: Yes, we have.

MR. de GRANDPRE: The CBC for these films?

MRS. NESBITT: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: What was their reply?

MRS. NESBITT: No.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Did they give you any reason?

MRS. NESBITT: No -- well, I think it was just not their policy.

MR. de GRANDPRE: It was against their policy?

MRS. NESBITT: I think so, but it was definitely no, and that they never do it.

MRS. WISHART: And yet they did it ---

MRS. NESBITT: No, those were tape recordings.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But these programmes that were televised, they were strictly Guide programmes in the sense that there were no professional actors?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Was there any music in the programmes?

MRS. NESBITT: I think not, no.

MRS. WISHART: One was a rally in Winnipeg and there might have been a band. We did not want the music, we only wanted to see it, we did not want to hear it.

MRS. NESBITT: We did not want sound, just to be able to see it.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Are you in a position to give us your opinion as to the quality of programmes which appeal to the girls within the age range of the Guides, either put on by the CBC or the private stations? Have you ever discussed this

angle of the broadcasting problem?

MRS. NESBITT: I think the programmes that appeal to the girls are the news programmes such as I spoke of, and I think that the story of Guiding would appeal to the girls, not so much from the interpreting angle, the way we do things, because they know that, but more from the angle of the history and facts about Guiding.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But this is a project of the future, but as far as past experience is concerned do you have any opinion as to the value of the programmes which are now broadcast?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. de Grandpre, just so I will be clear, are you talking just of Guiding programmes or programmes generally?

MR. de GRANDPRE: No, programmes which are designed for youngsters within the age range of the Girl Guides.

MRS. NESBITT: Mr. Chairman, could I ask what Mr. de Grandpre means by the value -- you mean the amount they are looked at?

MR. de GRANDPRE: No, about the quality and whether you feel that they are objectionable?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: We had a lot of criticism throughout the country on the nature of the programmes that are put on by various stations and by various sponsors for children, that they are not suitable for children, and with your experience in Girl Guides I think it would be helpful to us to get an expression of your opinion as to the

programmes generally that are put on radio and television for the younger generation.

MRS. NESBITT: We have not studied it, Mr. Chairman, from the point of view of what our Girl Guides look at, and I do not think that I can give an expression of opinion because I do not look at these programmes myself and I am not well enough informed. Could you, Mrs. Wishart?

MRS. WISHART: I think when we were preparing this brief we were only preparing the brief for the Girl Guides and it was not our duty to discuss all children's programmes, all we want to do is get more Guide programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: What we are trying to do is take advantage of your being here, if you could give us any light on the thing, the quality of programmes for the group that you are in very close contact with. We do not want to press you but if you have any views we will be glad to have them.

MRS. NESBITT: I think I can speak from my own household because they are in the age group and they are in the Guides and Scouts, and I do feel there are programmes that are good for children to look at at an hour when they should be doing something else, such as their homework or eating their supper. There are programmes at the hour or a little later than that when our Guide group age would be around, perhaps up to nine o'clock, which are not suitable for them to look at, but they probably have the time to do so. That is only

my own experience.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: If I am not mistaken, you are speaking on behalf of the national organization?

MRS. NESBITT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You suggest here that TV seems to be the perfect medium for informing the public about Guide activities, and that perhaps shorts could be made on such subjects as pioneer camping, woodcraft, homemaking or other aspects of the Guide programme. Are you thinking of it as live broadcasts or film?

MRS. NESBITT: Film is what we are thinking of.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Have you ever approached the National Film Board about this?

MRS. NESBITT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: I think they do all that sort of thing.

MRS. NESBITT: That seems to be the trouble, they do all that and cannot do anything for one. We asked them at one time when we had a national camp to make a film for us, and they felt they could not do it for us because it might involve doing it for too many other organizations.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Of all types?

MRS. NESBITT: Yes, if they singled out one they would have to do it for the others.

MRS. WISHART: They refused; we asked them.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You mean they do not

have a film on Girl Guides or Scouts?

MRS. NESBITT: No, they may have general films on youth or camping, but they are very loath to do one --

THE CHAIRMAN: In general but not specifically for one organization?

MRS. WISHART: We do not know if they have one for the Boy Scouts, we do not know.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: But to your knowledge they do not?

MRS. WISHART: We do not know.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: That would seem to be a way of getting on the air very quickly, a film made by the National Film Board, and I think the National Film Board has circuits throughout the country, mobile units, and you would get very quickly national distribution for your Girl Guide films.

MRS. WISHART: We thought we had a perfect subject at the national camp at Ottawa a few years ago, but they would not take it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for coming and we will consider your brief.

-

-

-

SUBMISSION OF
'VISITES INTERPROVINCIALES'

Appearances:

Mr. J. H. Biggar, Director

- - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: Our next brief is to be presented. This is a short one in size at least, and is to be presented by Mr. J. H. Biggar. We will mark the brief No. 126.

EXHIBIT NO. 126: Brief of 'Visites Interprovinciales'.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you present the brief and speak to it in any way you see fit?

MR. BIGGAR: "Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, 'Visites Interprovinciales' is a non-profit society for encouraging and arranging visits by English-speaking boys and girls to French-speaking homes and vice versa. The movement of which it is the organ has been growing for twenty years. Some 5500 such visits have been arranged.

"The experience of the society throughout Ontario convinces its directors that there is a strong latent desire here among the English-speaking to increase their command of the French language. They believe that, given time, French broadcasts, telecasts and lessons might find growing audiences here. Such activities would seem a proper purpose of

a national system.

"They believe that they speak for over five thousand families who by their personal efforts have shown sincere desire to make the two parts of Canada better known to each other."

(Page 3160 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to add anything to your brief at the present stage, arising from your experience?

MR. BIGGAR: I would be glad to, Mr. Commissioners.

Looking at this question of the status of French shows discussed here earlier this morning and in this room last week I believe, from a long range point of view -- my personal occupation is history -- I think it is certainly a fact that in English-speaking Canada two generations ago the status of the French language from the emotional point of view and from the point of view of prejudice, was very much different from what it is now. That is looking two generations back. Looking two generations ahead, with the vast improvement in communications and transportation that we are undergoing, we may look forward to Canadians of a different kind. We have seen Canada change in two generations. In two more generations they may be expected to change further.

Now, the question, I think, that faces this Commission now is: Where are we at between those two points? Evidence is very hard to come by, and I don't pretend in the brief statement before you to offer you very precise, telling statistical information, but what we suggest in this paragraph is that at least five thousand families have not merely said that they were interested in the other language; they have taken themselves up and moved about and done something about it. So that in

considering the question in the future that, at least, is a little bit of evidence.

THE CHAIRMAN: These fifty-five hundred visits that have been arranged -- do they take the form of a young person from Ontario going down to live for a time in Quebec, or would the fifty-five hundred include shorter visits than that?

MR. BIGGAR: They include shorter visits, possibly even as short as a week; but there would be nothing included there that wasn't a bona fide visit to a dwelling of the other language. It would not mean going to a hotel, or . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: . . . a business trip, or something?

MR. BIGGAR: . . . or a business trip, or something like that. It is a bona fide visit to a dwelling for the purpose of making the better acquaintance of the people of the other language. And of the fifty-five hundred I would say that between seventy and eighty per cent are of at least two weeks' duration, and many, many much longer.

THE CHAIRMAN: At least two weeks for that high percentage?

MR. BIGGAR: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Could you tell us whether the fifty-five hundred represents the traffic from Ontario to Quebec only, or does it include the reciprocal traffic?

MR. BIGGAR: Well, as I say, they aren't

very good statistics. Those are the statistics of the actual visits that have been made. There would be some duplicating because they might have been repeated; so that it wouldn't be fifty-five hundred families.

On the other hand, the figure might be doubled because in each case two families are involved, one making the visit and the other receiving it.

THE CHAIRMAN: So the real question here is much bigger than fifty-five hundred? You are speaking of visits of English-speaking boys and girls to French-speaking families?

MR. BIGGAR: Well ----

THE CHAIRMAN: And vice versa?

MR. BIGGAR: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And I think the question here is whether this includes the "vice versa" or not?

MR. BIGGAR: Yes, it does.

THE CHAIRMAN: The fifty-five hundred ---

MR. BIGGAR: Cut that in half.

MR. COYNE: But, on the other hand, the point you have just made is that this five thousand families are those who have either sent their children to Quebec families, or have received Quebec children in return?

MR. BIGGAR: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Do you operate on a reciprocal basis? Do the two families exchange children, so to speak?

MR. BIGGAR: We operate as an agency for

putting people in touch with each other, and each individually, so that the desires of those individuals are what governs. We recommend, however, that the most successful cases are those in which the relations are fully reciprocal. That is, as you say, the exchange visits.

MR. COYNE: Do you have anything to do with the Visites Universites, between the University of Montreal and the University of Toronto?

MR. BIGGAR: No. That is an outgrowth.

MR. COYNE: That is an outgrowth of that development?

MR. BIGGAR: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Do you think their activities, which are somewhat akin to yours, would increase the number of families, let us say, in Toronto, which would have the same type of interest?

MR. BIGGAR: Yes.

MR. COYNE: I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Do I take it, therefore, that you concur in the brief previously submitted by L'Alliance Canadienne who were here, and do I gather from your comments that you are making a similar request, that French broadcasting and telecasting and so forth should serve a growing audience here? Would you care to comment on that?

MR. BIGGAR: I don't think I am ---

THE CHAIRMAN: You endorse the brief?

MR. BIGGAR: I endorse the brief and I

furnish this amount of evidence.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Yes, I see.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just going back to your illustration from an historical point of view that there has been a pretty major change in attitude in the area that you know best, here in Toronto where you live, in two generations and there may be in two more a still greater change -- you very fairly point out you don't know exactly where they are in this move between these two extremes?

MR. BIGGAR: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: And the problem, of course, is to determine whether or not additional expenditure of public moneys for that purpose is justified at the moment. We will have to find out what that expenditure is and what the technical difficulties are and so on; but I take it from your brief that you feel, from your contacts, that there is a real public to be served in bringing the French language into the Toronto area?

MR. BIGGAR: I think so. Although there have been such successes as the visits of the Comedie Francaise there have been some flops, too.

THE CHAIRMAN: So that we are at a point in decision which is not easy to come by?

MR. BIGGAR: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Biggar, thank you very much. You will realize that this brief of yours is on a very specific point, and there isn't a great deal we have to ask you about it, because it is very clear.
---Short recess.

SUBMISSION OF
THE WOMEN'S INTER-CHURCH COUNCIL OF CANADA

Appearances:

Mrs. P. K. Hambly

Mrs. J. L. Halpenny

- - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is to be presented by the Women's Inter-Church Council of Canada. I understand the president, Mrs. P. K. Hambly, is here. You may have some associates with you, Mrs. Hambly. Will you come forward and bring your associates with you?

MRS. HAMBLY: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, may I present Mrs. Halpenny who is a member of our publicity committee. She will assist in the presentation of the brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. We will mark your brief as Exhibit 127.

EXHIBIT NO. 127: Brief of Women's Inter-Church Council of Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you, perhaps, read the brief as it is a short one?

MRS. HAMBLY: Thank you. May I also apologize for the absence of Mrs. Laidler, the Chairman of our Publicity Committee, who prepared the brief. Mrs. Laidler is ill and not able to come.

THE CHAIRMAN: We had her name down. We are sorry she is not here.

MRS. HAMBLY: Yes.

"Mr. Chairman and members of the Royal Commission on Broadcasting, the subject of radio and television broadcasting is of supreme importance to the women of Canada for three reasons.

"First, as homemakers we have opportunity for many day-time hours of viewing and listening while husbands and children are at work or school.

"Second, as mothers, we are vitally concerned with anything that contributes to the entertainment or education of our children.

"In view of the fact that one billion dollars of taxpayers' money has already been invested in television stations, equipment and sets, and that the value of radio sets in use amounts to about \$200 million, we, as guardians of the household budgets are anxious that we receive the best possible value for this huge investment.

"The Women's Inter-Church Council of Canada represents the women of all the major Protestant denominations, its members being elected annually by their respective boards. At present the membership is made up of Anglicans, Baptists, Presbyterians, United Church, Lutheran, Church of Christ Disciples, Friends and the Salvation Army; therefore we represent many hundreds of thousands of women in all parts of Canada and in all walks of life."

May I also state that this is an entirely

voluntary organization. There are no paid official members of the Council.

"As members of a Christian society and more particularly as members of the Christian Church, we believe that whatever affects man affects him mentally, morally and spiritually, or in other words, we believe that whatever man sees, hears or does affects him ultimately in every part of his being. In view of the many thousands of hours spent by so many thousands of people in viewing and listening to television and radio, and in view of the millions of dollars spent on this medium, what is offered for consumption over the air waves is of great concern to us.

"We fully realize that it is not possible to please everybody, but in the mind of the Council the following points are of the utmost importance:

"First, assurance should be given that nothing will be broadcast at any time that might be morally or spiritually degrading.

"Second, programmes depicting crime in any form -- even detective stories -- should be broadcast at an hour when children will be least likely to hear them. Much juvenile delinquency has been traced to the influence of such broadcasts, and many children suffer from horrible nightmares after witnessing this type of programme just before bedtime.

"Third, in keeping with the purpose of the day, all Sunday programmes should be as free as possible from advertising, the name of the sponsoring firm being mentioned at the beginning and at the end of the programme only. This would be much appreciated by the women of Canada (who do 80 per cent of the buying!)

"4. All advertising should be fair and in good taste, and should be given as an adjunct to a programme rather than as a programme highlight. Women are emphatic that overdone advertising irritates rather than convinces and mars an otherwise good programme."

Might I state that we asked for comments from members of our Council, and I think everyone agreed on that.

"5. There should be more programmes representing Canadian life, past and present, in all its aspects, national, industrial and cultural. Valuable also would be programmes concerned with the great world movements such as the Red Cross, UNESCO, etc."

I might say that the working out of the Colombo Plan should be very interesting to Canadians.

"6. There is a need for programmes which would provide opportunity for Canadian women to impart to each other something of the various cultures which go to make up our composite nation, thereby promoting a more sympathetic understanding throughout the Dominion."

We feel that this can be undertaken only by a national

organization since local stations are concerned with things in their local area; consequently, the responsibility must rest with the CBC.

"7. It is very desirable that there should be more programmes whose underlying principles uphold the conceptions of wholesome family life; of co-operation rather than self-interest, of honesty rather than deceit, of amity rather than hatred.

"The Women's Inter-Church Council wish to record their commendation of many CBC features, notably:- World Church News, Morning Devotions, Sunday School of the Air, the School Broadcasts, Citizens' Forum, many CBC Wednesday Nights, the noon Farm Broadcast with its wholesome Craig Family, the dramatization of good books -- there are good books which we haven't recorded here, and we would like to mention 'Trans-Canada Matinee' and 'Open House' -- News Round-Ups and United Nations on the Record, Music, especially the orchestras and choirs from various parts of Canada and from ethnic groups (for example, Songs of My People), and many others.

"The Council further commends the CBC for some fine children's broadcasts now included on both television and radio. There is, however, an absence of broadcasts with religious education emphasis, and we trust that, before too long, programmes will be

considered which contain spiritual values for growing children.

"The Council also thanks the CBC sincerely for its courtesy in arranging for an annual network broadcast on the day preceding the Women's World Day of Prayer; at the same time it expresses the hope that a similar courtesy may be presently extended to include an annual period on television."

Perhaps we should state, in regard to this CBC broadcast on the day before the World Day of Prayer, that in doing this the CBC is joining with many other countries in this world, because this World Day of Prayer is really, as it states, a Worldwide one. It is a unifying force, we feel, among the women of the world. During the last programme we knew that 134 countries were joining in this. In 1957 we hope that women in 141 countries will take part in using the same programme. In Canada there were 3000 communities where this was being observed.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, may I ask that Mrs. Halpenny elaborate on some of the points?

THE CHAIRMAN: We will be glad to hear her.

MRS. HAMBLY: I should state that Mrs. Halpenny is chairman of the Children's Work Committee of the Department of Nursery Education of the Canadian Council of Churches.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mrs. Halpenny?

MRS. HALPENNY: I might just add a word in that portion of our brief where we mention children's programmes, because of my interest in children's work.

We feel this is an important phase. We feel that television especially is having an enlightening effect on children's lives.

We noted that an authority on education, Dr. Phimister, mentioned last week when in Toronto that the home used to set the standard by which success was judged, but today they are set by people in movies and television, and we hope the time will come when the CBC will be able to give serious consideration to this business of broadcasts that will have a religious emphasis, none of which has to be sectarian or doctrinarian, but there might be broadcasts which would have spiritual values which are relevant as to the child's situation in the family and in the neighbourhood and in the community and so on.

Well, we hope that this will be possible, and, of course, we would like to have them at a time when it would be convenient for children to view them, perhaps Saturday morning or Sunday afternoon or similar times, when children would be free to see them.

We say that at present it is a problem for the CBC, but we feel that through the Canadian Council of Churches, or the National Religious

Advisory Council, we could work together on this in order to make it available for children, because we do feel it is such a strong medium for education.

I would also like to add to what Mrs. Hambly said about some of the present programmes. I have not a television set, but I do listen to Trans-Canada Matinee when I am at home, and I think it is a splendid programme, because it is giving the women of Canada an indication of some of the cultural developments in Canada. It keeps them in touch with current events, and it has some very practical help for mothers in the home.

Now, if there are any questions?

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Could you tell us how this brief was prepared? Was it prepared by the National Council and then submitted to the local councils and then distributed among the members and then returned to the National Council for comment, or was it simply the work of the National Council?

MRS. HAMBLY: It is the work of the National Council, but we had asked as widely as we could for comments from others who were not on the Council. We didn't have time to get in touch with the whole three thousand local councils.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But they have annual meetings?

MRS. HAMBLY: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And were these problems discussed at any time at these annual meetings before

the brief was prepared, or before there was a suggestion that there would be a Commission on Broadcasting?

MRS. HAMBLY: Mr. Chairman, we have discussed these problems. We have had protests from various parts of Canada at different times asking if we could do something about programmes, and we had no means of doing anything about programmes. We listed the comments which we had received in the past and added those which the Council themselves and other members in and around Toronto could give us.

MR. de GRANDPRE: The reason I am asking these questions is that there are very useful suggestions in your brief, and I would like to know whether they represent the views of the majority of the members of the Council. Could you tell me if this is, by and large, the expression of opinion of the majority of the members?

MRS. HAMBLY: I think that would be correct. We discussed this in Council. There are about forty members of the Council, and not all from Toronto -- from the neighbourhood; and they were agreed on this. They passed this brief at the Council meeting.

Our representatives are from all walks of life and, as you see, from all the major Protestant denominations. It is not one little group of people in Toronto.

THE CHAIRMAN: This line of questioning has nothing to do with throwing any doubt on your

brief. It is merely trying to ascertain the weight that the opinion should have.

MRS. HAMBLY: I was just wanting to point out it isn't just two or three of us who got together.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, you suggest that the women have time during the day to view, or listen, and there has been some suggestion that the number of hours of television broadcasting should be increased, and that it should start earlier in the day.

As you know, television is a more expensive means of broadcasting, and I would like to know whether the members of your Association feel that it is an advantage to have television during the day, or whether you would rather rely on radio alone?

MRS. HAMBLY: I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that that came up. We didn't mention that at the Council meeting. We had heard it discussed privately, and I have heard several members say that they thought we should have more Canadian programmes earlier in the day.

MR. de GRANDPRE: On --- ?

MRS. HAMBLY: On television.

MR. de GRANDPRE: On television?

MRS. HAMBLY: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You feel that Canadian housewives have time during the day to view television programmes?

MRS. HAMBLY: Well, a good many of them do.

MR. de GRANDPRE: When American programmes are available in the area; but in areas where there

is no American station giving the facilities do you feel there is an advantage in having television during the day, or whether the housewife simply does her work without looking at the TV set and she is simply listening to it as a set, thereby obtaining results very similar to the result she would get on radio alone?

MRS. HAMBLY: I think there is a point there, Mr. Commissioner. But I think women are learning to do their work and watch television at the same time.

MRS. HALPENNY: It is amazing how many of my friends say they can make meals and watch the television at the same time; and they are doing their ironing and watching the television at the same time; and they can knit and sew even when watching television. So I think it wouldn't interfere too much with their housework; and with our modern methods of doing housework it is done in the morning, pretty well, with most women. I think a number of them would be, perhaps, with the work they can do -- they would be freer to watch then. Then, when the family arrives at dinner time, when everybody is wanting his own programme, well, perhaps, mother has to lose out!

MRS. HAMBLY: I think we should remember, too, that the modern home is an open space. It is not an enclosed kitchen and a separate dining room and living room. The house is open, and the woman can work in the kitchen and watch the television

in the living room.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I see that the housewives complain that advertising mars an otherwise good programme; and it is they who do the buying. I asked a specific question yesterday of the advertisers, and the question was this: Do you think it is possible to have indirect advertising? Their answer was: Definitely no, because the advertising material loses its impact. I see that you have an opposite view, and as you are the buyers maybe you would like to expand a little on that and tell us the reasons why you object to too much advertising. If the advertisers are right, that you buy more by listening to more advertising, then there is somewhat of a conflict between the two views.

MRS. HALPENNY: Well, I think it isn't advertising that we object to. I think it is the "too much" and the "too similar". After all, the advertising very often is repeated time and time again on the same product, and I think most women become irritated by it a little.

I think there is a different system employed in England, that they don't have just the same type of direct advertising with their sponsored programmes, that it is more indirect.

I think, too, that, perhaps, the advertisers overdo the influence on children. I find so many of my friends say "I have got to buy Sunbeam bread," or "I have to buy the cereals with the toys in them, because it is on television." Some of them are

getting very tired of shopping and changing and having to listen to this all the time. Perhaps that proves the advertisers' point, but the reaction on them isn't always so very pleasant.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But would you feel that the housewife would buy a product if the programme were simply introduced at the beginning by saying "This programme is presented to you by the "'X' Company" and at the end of the programme saying "This programme has been presented by the 'X' Company, manufacturers of such-and-such a product," and leaving it at that?

MRS. HAMBLY: No. I think that is too little, Mr. Commissioner. I think I can put it this way, that we don't approve of it as the programme highlight. We feel there is too much importance given to it by some firms. Now, that is the type of advertising that we would like to see on Sunday, where it would be mentioned before and at the end of the programme. We feel that is more fitting for Sunday programmes. But we consider that that would be too little, that you wouldn't get sponsors ---

MR. de GRANDPRE: You would like to see a happy medium between the week day and Sunday broadcasts?

MRS. HAMBLY: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I take it you do go along with the advertisers' contention that, as they put it, I thought, very frankly, "The viewer or the

listener, in enduring the commercials, is paying the price of the entertainment"?

MRS. HAMBLY: If there isn't too much of it. When it becomes overpowering, as some of the commercials are when the one speaking for the sponsor has an almost evangelistic fervour in his advocacy of the product it is irritating. You just make up your mind that is the thing you won't buy! It can be overdone.

I think women as a whole are reasonable, and they feel ---

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a subject we are not going to get into!

MRS. HAMBLY: Especially the singing commercials -- they really get us down sometimes!

MR. de GRANDPRE: We have been told by some groups that the sponsorship of children's programmes should be avoided as much as possible because, as you indicated, the parents feel the impact of the advertising and, to some extent, it reduces the quality of the programme as a children's programme. Are you objecting to sponsorship of children's programmes as a matter of principle, or would you like to qualify your opinion?

MRS. HALPENNY: Well, I know the extreme cost of television. I don't think it would be possible to look for children's programmes that weren't sponsored; but I would hope that the CBC would continue to give programmes for children that were CBC productions and not sponsored commercially, because you do have some very good ones

now for children.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But you don't mind if some advertising is presented on or during these programmes?

MRS. HALPENNY: No; I think we would have to be practical and realize that there must be some.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just on that point, you are suggesting in your brief various kinds of programmes which, in many cases, might not attract sponsorship ---

MRS. HAMBLY: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: --- which require to have public moneys to be devoted to them. I take it that notwithstanding the fact that you say in Item 3 on page 1 that you are the captains of the household budget -- you feel this is a justifiable expenditure of public money?

MRS. HAMBLY: Absolutely, Mr. Chairman.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And may I ask you this question that I asked the Girl Guide Organization -- about your opinion on, your appreciation, or judgment on the value of children's programmes as they are today?

MRS. HALPENNY: We feel in our children's work, because we discussed this and I happened to be attending the Nursery Association Conference for Ontario some weeks ago where there were a great number -- some two hundred -- of nursery school leaders, and they spent some time discussing this question, and they were of the opinion that one of their main problems was with nursery school

children and how much could be done by television and so on, and they were emphatic that some of the programmes like the Puppets -- there was some discussion about Lassie, but the majority in the end favoured Lassie as a good programme for children; and they mentioned such others as The Makers of Music -- and I had the privilege of watching a very good one at one time where one of our leading violinists explained to the children how violin music was written and played, and I thought what an excellent cultural programme that was; and then the Disneyland ones, and that other one they call About Canada. All these they mentioned as being excellent CBC presentations. These leaders said: "Well, television is with us, and it is with us to stay, and, of course, in some way -- and I don't think we are just sure how we are to do it -- but we have got to help our children to use discrimination so that they will be able to discipline themselves as to the type of programme they will view." Now, that is going to be a long-term process; but we didn't think that we could do too much by parental censorship, that we had to start and educate them to be selective. But, in the meantime, a big responsibility rests on the CBC to try to give the children the best programmes they can, and, by and large, they feel that there are very many good ones.

I do notice -- I listen outside my window and I hear the children playing "Cops and robbers" and so on, and that doesn't bother me so much as

when they are playing "Indians and cowboys" because I certainly think we shouldn't put too much emphasis on the animosity between the Indians and the other residents of Canada, because we have Indians in our midst. In that kind of thing I think we should be careful, that when you are providing programmes for children nothing of an inter-racial nature is going to creep in.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do the children view the programmes that you call the cultural or educational programmes for children, or do they simply go out and play "cowboys and Indians" and "cops and robbers" when these programmes are on?

MRS. HALPENNY: I can only speak from what these nursery school leaders were talking about -- and they are dealing with more children than I would have any contact with -- and they seem to feel that they did -- that they were being used and appreciated because of the conversation of the children when they come to school the next morning, you see. They said that with some of these programmes -- the animals, for instance -- they noticed that there was quite a difference in the children's conversation at school the next morning if these programmes had been on, and they said, in fact, "You are just not one of the group unless you know what happened to 'Lassie' yesterday", and so on and so forth. So they must be watching them.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just have a couple of questions. You pointed out at the very beginning

of your brief that, as homemakers, your group have an opportunity for many daytime hours of viewing. Am I right in concluding that the serious or more cultural type of programme -- using that word in a very broad sense -- is, in fact listened to on the radio and, perhaps, viewed on the television and that it isn't immediately turned off in favour of purely entertainment programmes? I am referring to the various programmes which you have listed in your brief?

MRS. HAMBLY: That is true, yes.

(Page 3184 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: We have had a conflict of evidence here as to whether or not the so-called cultural programme is, in fact, wanted and used, and anything you could say on that I would be interested in hearing.

MRS. HAMBLY: Mr. Chairman, we can only speak directly for the forty women who were present at the Council when this brief was presented, and they were unanimous in their approval of the programmes listed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Which meant they had been listening to them?

MRS. HAMBLY: Yes, and while we are all busy women on the Council, a number of the women said if it were not for those programmes they wouldn't think either a radio or a television in their home was worth while. They appreciate that type of programme.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well then, in the listing of programmes you mention quite a number of items that the CBC has brought, and you also state that you do spend many hours -- women do -- in listening during the day. Have you any comments on the programmes of the private stations, or did this come up at all?

MRS. HAMBLY: I don't think, Mr. Chairman, it came up particularly because we were considering the work done by the CBC.

MRS. HALPENNY: Well, I think that perhaps our opinion is inherent in one or two of these statements. For instance, when we say we would like

programmes that would provide opportunity for Canadian women to impart to each other something of the various cultures which go to make up our composite nation, we feel that can only be done by a national organization. It could not be as well done by local stations. For instance, just as the other Commissioner was speaking of the fact that so many of these programmes are not commercially self-supporting, as it were, and rightly or wrongly we believe the private stations have to depend more on commercial sponsorship for putting on programmes than do the CBC. I don't know whether we are right in that or not.

THE CHAIRMAN: I can understand with new ideas such as the one you mentioned, that might fit in with the CBC, that it might not be commercially sponsored, but you have today many dozens of private radio stations in Canada, and you have a few CBC stations in Canada. Your whole brief seems to be dealing with programming of the CBC, and I am merely raising the question as to whether you have any comments on the programmes that are available on the privately owned radio stations?

MRS. HAMBLY: Mr. Chairman, there were some members of the Council, particularly those from out of the city, who spoke about the local stations and said that a good many of their local stations did very good work locally in fostering some of the things that we mentioned; the integration of the new Canadians into Canadian life, and the

presentation of their background and culture and music, and so on, and they felt a good many of them were the integrating force, but our brief was connected with the CBC particularly.

MRS. HALPENNY: We are a women's inter-church council of Canada, and we don't have as close contact with local groups to get an informed opinion. We do hear indirectly of local happenings, such as the Girl Guides said, that when things of local interest happen, the private stations were very co-operative then and very useful. But we don't have that close contact with local groups to find out.

THE CHAIRMAN: We thank you both very much. This completes the list we had for this morning, but if there are any who were down for this afternoon who would like to come forward now we will be very glad to hear them.

We have the unusual situation of being through ahead of time, and since there are no volunteers, we will adjourn until two-thirty.

---The hearing adjourned at 11.55 until 2.30 p.m.

- - - - -

---Upon resuming at 2.30 p.m.

- - - - -

SUBMISSION OF
LABOR-PROGRESSIVE PARTY

Appearances:

Mr. John Stewart

Mr. Charles Sims

- - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: The first brief on the agenda this afternoon is that of the Labor-Progressive Party. Mr. Charles Sims. Have you anyone with you?

MR. SIMS: They are a little late, I think, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will go on, if you don't mind, and we will mark your brief as Exhibit 128.

EXHIBIT NO. 128: Brief of the Labor-Progressive Party.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not know that you were here at the outset this morning or any other morning, and I repeat that our procedure is to have the brief which has been submitted in writing either summarized or read, and if it is a short brief it is usually read. If it is a little longer it is usually summarized for we have seen it, and then we have questions which are merely designed to bring out points of view and the exact facts that the witnesses are presenting, but are not to be taken as indicating any opinion by the Commission.

Will you proceed, Mr. Sims?

MR. SIMS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, my colleague and I thank you on behalf of the Labor-Progressive Party for this opportunity to state our Party's views. Having followed the work of your Commission since you opened hearings in Ottawa, we feel confident that Canada's radio and television system will advance as a consequence of this Commission's work.

Our party's submission is before you, and I do not propose to read it. With your permission, we would like to amplify our submission, change one point in it, and try to emphasize a few of the main points in it.

First of all, the Labor-Progressive Party believes that the majority of Canadians want the CBC to improve and expand as a distinctively Canadian television and radio national service.

Because of this our party, on the chief question before this Commission -- that of finances -- supports the general proposals placed before you by the Board of Governors of the CBC on April 30th. That means, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, that we would delete from our submitted brief the third and fourth paragraphs on page 6.

The CBC estimates that for \$62 million a year it can improve its Canadian TV programming, extend its French and English network services, develop alternate services in main centres and

develop colour TV. Also, the CBC estimates that for \$17 million a year great improvements could be made in radio broadcasting on its French and English networks and services extended to the North.

The Labor-Progressive Party considers that the Canadian people would be prepared to support such a broad policy, costing about \$79 million a year.

As Mavor Moore, one of Canada's foremost artists, has said, and I quote him:

"What matters is not that we are Canadian, but that because we are Canadian we have a rare chance to contribute new ideas, techniques and methods to a world crying for them. We shall betray ourselves and humanity if we allow our wagon to get hitched to the glittering European past, the glittering American present, or any other nag than our own glittering future."

A feature of the times, clearly illustrated by the hearings of this Commission, and by the stormy debate in the House of Commons on the Trans-Canada gas pipeline, and the veritable upsurge of Canadian culture in all fields -- TV, radio, theatre, ballet, music and literature, is the new, sturdy growth of Canadian national consciousness and patriotism.

This new feature of our national life arises to resist and challenge the assault of

American penetration which is clear to see on all fields whether they be cultural or economic.

One thing we will all agree on. The CBC is faced with a rather big problem, competing as it does with the American TV networks. There is a significant public criticism that too much American programming is being used on CBC TV, and that not enough is being done by CBC to develop Canadian programmes on the English network.

Much of this imported American programming is in the form of films. For example, in the week of May 20-26, CBC TV showed nineteen American films that occupied nine hours of time. Also in that week the CBC TV put on seven live American shows that took up six hours and thirty-five minutes. This was away out of proportion to the Canadian content.

CBC itself buys these American films. We contend that this is wrong. CBC should not commit the same errors for which we criticize the privately owned TV stations. The CBC will say that this is due to lack of finances, but that is not the full answer by any means. With all the facilities that the CBC has at its command, with all the Canadian talent now available, and even with the moneys now at its disposal, we feel that the CBC could do a better job and put up a stronger resistance to the many pressures to load our national TV system with too many American films.

The remedy for this is in the hands of the Canadian people and their Parliament. That is why

the Labor-Progressive Party supports the general proposals of the CBC for its projected \$79 million programme of improvement and expansion of TV and radio. That is why we urge that the CBC Board of Governors and management embark upon a bolder and firmer policy of developing Canadian programming.

CBC should certainly utilize the best American programmes but do far more than is being done to exchange the best of our Canadian TV and radio programmes for the best of American programmes. At present it is practically a one-way street to the disadvantage of Canada. In the interests of Canadian programming development the exchange should be reciprocal -- programme for programme with the United States and other countries -- or the balance will be swung to foreign programming.

CBC should also develop a far stronger exchange of programmes with the BBC, Radio France and other national broadcasting systems.

CBC programming could, we think, be very greatly improved if more documentary films were made -- on the realities of Canadian life and work, our industries and agriculture, town planning, public works, also, if CBC co-operated more with local community cultural and sports organizations.

We also believe that the tariffs upon all TV and radio programmes sponsored, or used for advertising, imported into Canada, should be increased. Such tariffs should take into account the cost of producing such programmes in Canada and

the national interest of developing our own talent and protecting the rights of our artists, musicians and producers.

The Labor-Progressive Party believes that Canadians will support a policy that gives the CBC the tools to do the job it is required to do by the Canada Broadcasting Act -- to develop a national TV and radio service second to none.

We agree with the proposals for effective regulatory and control machinery -- but contend that such machinery should be administered in the public interest and not to serve the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters.

On the question of the Regulatory Board and regulations, our Party most decidedly opposes the theory and proposals of the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters and the Progressive Conservative Party. It is not true that -- and I quote here:

"Competition from private TV stations would raise the level of CBC programmes. In the case of radio, competition between the CBC and the privately owned stations has kept the quality of CBC broadcasts high, and the listening public has benefited."

That is the untrue statement of Mr. George Hees, M.P.

We hold that the CARTB is interested in big game, in striving towards utilizing the TV channels -- which are the property of the people -- to make

big profits from advertising. They want to be freed from control, and we think that they would like to tie up with the American TV networks.

On April 29th, in Washington, Senator John Bricker urged that the United States Congress act immediately to bring the TV networks under direct control of the government. He charged that the Columbia Broadcasting System and the National Broadcasting System are holding the entire industry in an economic stranglehold. In 1954 these two American TV giants had an income of \$90,600,000 which was equal to 99 per cent of their total capital investments.

The present state of affairs in most of the privately owned radio stations is a warning of what could happen very quickly if CARTB had their way with TV. Here are examples of how private radio stations abuse their trust:

Mr. K. V. McGee of Richmond Hill wrote the following to Ron Poulton of the Toronto Telegram, and it appeared in Mr. Poulton's See-Hear column of May 22nd:

"On the morning of May 10 I tuned in on a private Toronto station at exactly 26½ minutes past 8.00 p.m.

"In the 43½ minutes of listening time there were exactly 18 commercials, including repetitions. As I tuned out the announcer was starting commercial No. 19.

"I got about ten minutes in all, of news, shorts, bits of music and some disc jockey chatter."

Inasmuch as the privately owned TV and radio stations are utilizing publicly owned TV channels and radio wave lengths, we contend that such stations should be required, by law, to publish annual public statements, detailing their incomes, expenses, profits and losses.

An important fact, too, is that practically all of the privately owned radio stations, including CFRB and CKEY, in Toronto, do not follow a good labour policy. They do not co-operate with the labour unions and refuse to meet established trade union wage rates and conditions. We understand that CFRB here in Toronto netted about one million dollars last year but spent only \$60,000 on all its local programming. We understand that CKEY last year spent about \$37,000 on all its local programming.

Is it any wonder that people say our private radio stations, with very few exceptions, are glorified juke boxes for American records? We do not want a similar development in Canadian TV.

And the danger is very great when you remember that the rates here in Toronto for Class A 8 second advertising spots on CBLT are \$95; and for a 20 second spot, \$142.50. In Montreal the rates of CBFT are \$90 for a Class A 8 second advertising spot and \$135 for a 20 second spot.

The Labor-Progressive Party agrees with the

many who have already appeared before your Commission in regard to the urgent need for the Board of Governors of the CBC to take real measures to enforce present legislation and regulations and see to it that all private TV and radio stations observe the conditions of their licences, that is, to develop Canadian programming, to employ Canadian talent and to avoid excessive use of recorded or filmed programmes imported from the United States.

The national interest calls for effective regulations and control and we contend that the Board of Governors of the CBC should utilize the existing law to ensure this. We would suggest that the Board of Governors establish a genuine system of inspection and check-up in this regard, to guarantee that private TV and radio stations be monitored and that their logs be regularly checked.

We further suggest that legislation be enacted setting forth a range of fines that the Board of Governors would legally impose upon operators of private TV and radio stations who violate the Canada Broadcasting Act and CBC Regulations, and that, in the event of such an operator continuing to commit such violations his licence be either cancelled or suspended for a definite period of time, with the CBC either operating such station or arranging that it be operated by a person or company that would uphold the Act and the Regulations. Not less, but more control is needed over the privately owned TV and radio stations.

If CBC on its French TV network produces 85 per cent of its programmes, and is now planning to produce 60 per cent of its English TV network programmes, the privately owned TV stations should be required to produce 40 per cent of their own programmes in Canada. The Labor-Progressive Party considers that regulations of this kind should be adopted. Privately owned TV stations, for a very small licence fee, enjoy the monopoly use of a valuable public asset and also receive 40 hours of sustaining and commercial programmes from the CBC free of charge. In fact, they are subsidized by the taxpayers.

They should be required to obey the CBC Regulations regarding "the greater use of Canadian talent" and the limitation of advertising, and the CBC Regulations should be tightened up and vigorously enforced to compel them to do so.

Broadcasting regulations are, or should be, the laws of broadcasting and must be enforced. The inclusion on the schedule of Canadian programming and production should not merely be a moral obligation but rather a condition of licensing.

An effective Canadian TV and radio service requires:

- 1) Understanding and definition of the relationship between the CBC national service and privately owned local outlets -- with an effective controlling body;

- 2) Adequate financing of CBC to provide

capital needs, operating funds -- the facilities and personnel;

3) Government and Parliament responsibility to the people in directing programme and technical exchanges and encouraging the fullest development of Canada's most valuable assets -- her people -- in the creation of their culture, their arts.

Finally, as a way to strengthen the CBC Board of Governors in every respect to handle the great problems they face in the years ahead, we wish to emphasize our view that the Board should be enlarged by the addition of representatives of the Canadian Congress of Labor and the farm movement.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your courtesy and if you have any questions arising from our party's submission, or my remarks, we will be pleased to answer to the best of our ability.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne, have you any questions?

MR. COYNE: Mr. Sims, turning to your brief, which has been marked Exhibit 128, the second last paragraph on page 2, you say what the LPP objects to is the trend of the CBC, and even more so of the private stations, to foist on Canadian TV and radio audiences a mass of American-produced programmes regardless of their quality or interest to Canadians.

Are you saying here, when you use the word "trend", there has recently been an increase in the

number or proportion of American produced programmes brought into Canada?

MR. SIMS: I think so. I have a copy here of the check I made. I think it would prove that.

MR. COYNE: Some of our information -- some of the representations have rather indicated that the trend is the other way, and I was interested in the figures you gave for the importations during the week May 20-26 on the CBC English TV network. You said there were nine hours of United States films and six hours and thirty-five minutes of United States live shows, which is a total of fifteen hours and thirty-five minutes, as against, I believe, a total broadcast time of something in the neighbourhood of fifty hours a week, which would seem to indicate that in that week the proportion of United States produced programmes on the CBC English TV network was 30 per cent. Is that an actual analysis of your ---

MR. SIMS: That does not give you the fair picture. In addition to that there are quite a few other American importations, and I would like to say this, in the case of quite a few of these films they are substitutions for live shows. I am not an expert on the question, but I would be inclined to think this, with the summer coming on there will be an even greater proportion of American films on CBC.

MR. COYNE: Just dealing with the week and the figures you gave us, do I understand you to say now that the figure of 15 hours and 35 minutes of

importations during that week is not an accurate figure?

MR. SIMS: Well, that is the figure that I checked from the CBC Times. It lists the main feature shows, most of them. Have you a copy of this? Most of those shows, if you will look, are in the best spots of the day or the evening.

MR. COYNE: You were giving us these figures as indicating the American films and live shows which were carried by the CBC network during that week, I am right, am I?

MR. SIMS: Yes.

MR. COYNE: And they amounted to 15 hours and 35 minutes, and the total network time during the week I am given to understand is 50 hours. So that the proportion would be roughly 30 per cent during that week?

MR. SIMS: That is true, but the main point is that the greater proportion of the CBC's other 35 hours would not be of the character of feature shows such as this. That is the point that we are describing.

MR. COYNE: Would you care to indicate to us how much United States programming there should be? I gather you do not want to exclude it altogether.

MR. SIMS: No, no. We agree fully with the general policy as we understand it, that Mr. Dunton made before the Board, that the Canadian programming should run up to 60 per cent. If I

could make a guess and figure that not less than 10 per cent of the programmes could be obtained from the BBC, Radio France and other national networks, you might get a figure of 30 per cent American.

MR. COYNE: Isn't that precisely the figure we have for this week of May 20-26?

MR. SIMS: No, I do not think so for if you look at these shows -- you have a list there -- you will find that generally speaking they not only occupy the main hours, both in regard to children's programmes, and then the evening programmes, but they would be in a certain sense the heavy artillery of the CBC that week, and they are out of all proportion of possibility of developing Canadian entertainment, because most of them are entertainment shows that we think could be developed in Canada.

MR. COYNE: I notice on Friday, May 25, the only importation was Roy Rogers from five to five-thirty, and NBC Sports from ten to ten-forty-five, which would indicate, I presume, that the balance of the evening's programmes from five-thirty to ten o'clock were not United States imports?

MR. SIMS: That was Thursday you are speaking of?

MR. COYNE: Friday.

MR. SIMS: That was the evening of the great Canadian classic, the Plouffe Family, but that was not typical of that week.

MR. COYNE: You did say you thought on

an average, 30 per cent might be a proper proportion for American programmes on the CBC network?

MR. SIMS: No, I did not say that. You are speaking here about feature programmes, and that is the point.

THE CHAIRMAN: You did say a minute ago ---

MR. SIMS: I am trying to point out that a check of the CBC feature programmes of May 20-26 would indicate that, oh, I would think it would be 70 to 30, comparing American feature programmes as compared to Canadian, which is only one, of course, on the general overall picture.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me see if I understand your point. You do not disagree with the fact that if you judge this by the hour, you have given us a list here of imported programmes of 15 3/4 hours, as we make it out or thereabouts, out of a total CBC television programming of 50 hours. You are not suggesting you have left some American programmes off this list, are you?

MR. SIMS: No, these are the feature programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am saying, as a matter of hours spent, 15 hours are taken up by these imported programmes out of a total of 50.

MR. SIMS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is approximately 30 per cent?

MR. SIMS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is one method of

measurement, but your point is that 30 per cent is more important because they happened to be, you suggest, more of a feature?

MR. SIMS: Feature programmes. I do not know if you would care to look over the week.

THE CHAIRMAN: We can see that. We have that.

MR. SIMS: From the point of view of the disproportion of Canadian shows of that type, which we think could be produced here.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Sims, turning to the matter of financing, is it your view that the CBC should not accept any advertising and should depend wholly for its revenues upon public funds?

MR. SIMS: Well, as I said, delete from our brief the two paragraphs on page 6.

MR. COYNE: But you left in, in the second paragraph on that page, you say:

"We propose that CBC be relieved of the necessity to cater to commercialism."

Does that mean you think there should be no commercial sponsorship on CBC?

MR. SIMS: No, I think what we mean by that is that the CBC should be relieved of the situation at the moment where they must cater to commercialism exclusively. And generally speaking, we agree with the broad general policies suggested by Mr. Dunton.

MR. COYNE: How do you define excessive

commercialism?

MR. SIMS: Well, I would say too much of it.

MR. COYNE: How much is "too much"?

MR. SIMS: Oh, I guess that would depend on who was answering the question. I would think it is too much at the present time.

MR. COYNE: But you are not in a position to suggest to us how much should be eliminated in order that there no longer be too much?

MR. SIMS: Well, I believe if this Commission and eventually Parliament would agree with the main general proposals of the CBC Board of Governors, that that would answer the question.

MR. COYNE: In other words, you are prepared to see the CBC accept commercial revenue on the basis that the CBC had in mind when they made their representations to this Commission?

MR. SIMS: I think so. I think that is about as good as we could expect it at the minute. Mr. Dunton did not break that down from the angle of what proportion from commercial programmes he included in the \$79 million.

MR. COYNE: My recollection at the moment is that the CBC did not suggest to us that the ~~amount~~ ~~of revenue~~ they were obtaining from commercial sources was excessive. I am just quoting from memory now.

MR. SIMS: I do not think they did. In the memorandum they submitted I do not think they detailed that.

MR. COYNE: I wonder if you would turn now to page 7 where you set forth certain problems which you think the C.B.C. should tackle in the years ahead, and I am looking at paragraph (c) where you say they should consider, "Adopting a full programme for encouraging Canadian creative artists and musicians to produce works for CBC-TV and radio, including the granting of bursaries to talented people, the stimulation of such artistic production through competitions with adequate financial prizes, and the establishment of a system where aspiring artists, writers and musicians could receive training"

I would just like to ask you whether you think really that these extra-curricular activities are the proper function of the C.B.C.?

We have rather gathered the contrary, that the C.B.C. has its hands full in carrying on broadcasting without extending itself into these broader fields where other types of organizations might presumably as well do the job.

MR. SIMS: Well, it may be at the moment that the C.B.C. has more than gets its hands full, but the intent in that paragraph is for a broad, national policy that would give the C.B.C. the responsibility that we think it is uniquely fitted to assume in the Canadian cultural scene. I think the C.B.C. is doing something of this description now in a limited way. I might point out that the last two or three annual reports indicate

that they are, in co-operation with writers, magazines and various organizations in the country, striving to improve various elements of their T.V. programming; so that I think it would be quite practical providing that the Commission and the Government gives them the money to do it.

MR. COYNE: In any event, you say these activities, in your submission, are subsidiary to their broadcasting function?

MR. SIMS: Subsidiary, but very vitally important to it. I think it would go quite a bit toward answering some of the questions on talent, that, without such a very definitely directed policy may be lost to Canada. I think they would, much more than they are doing now, co-operate with the universities and the school system of the country in that regard and be on the alert for Canadian talent, to raise it in whatever way they could, in the way that we suggest here.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Would you allow me to interject a question there?

On the other hand, it has been submitted to us, Mr. Sims, that there is a problem from the point of view of musicians anyway, that there are more musicians today than can possibly be employed; and if we were to go ahead with your suggestion at the expense of considerable public funds wouldn't we just be exaggerating the problem that is already with us? Because I think the Musicians' Union have complained that there is not enough work

for the talent that exists; and I would judge that, probably, the Royal Conservatory of Music have difficulty in finding employment for the talent that they train.

MR. SIMS: Well, I would answer that this way: If the Board of Governors of the C.B.C. could see their way to enforce the regulations of the C.B.C. that flow from the Canadian Broadcasting Act, that is, to have more of the 167, I think, private radio stations and the 28 or so private T.V. stations to use live Canadian talent, there might be a surplus of other talent. I don't think we have a surplus of that type of Canadian talent at the moment.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: So far as the evidence laid before us would indicate it is that there is a surplus.

MR. SIMS: I don't think so. I can't say the number of live Canadian musicians and artists employed by CFRB or CKEY, but I am fairly sure that the number wouldn't include my two hands. When you multiply ---

THE CHAIRMAN: But if the time should even come when there was a shortage of artists, about which, as Mr. Stewart says, contrary evidence has been given to us, do you seriously argue that it ought to be a function of the C.B.C., however much they may be interested in adequate supplies of artists and writers, just as they may be interested in an adequate supply of electronic engineers,

or an adequate supply of athletes for sporting programmes -- to seriously argue that the C.B.C. function should include the job of stimulating artistic production through competition and the establishment of a system whereby aspiring artists and writers and musicians could receive training? You say "adopt a full programme for developing Canadian creative artists". Isn't there some organizational limit beyond which everything that seems to be desirable in this country is imposed on the C.B.C.?

MR. SIMS: We don't suggest putting the whole thing on the C.B.C.; but, for example, if the C.B.C., within the terms of their power according to the Act, were to open up a competition in Canada, say, for good T.V. programmes on some of our great Canadian heroes and heroines, it would have a great effect nationally.

THE CHAIRMAN: That may be, but why should they train the artists and writers and musicians to be able to put on that programme, any more than they should go and train hockey players to put on the hockey broadcasts?

MR. SIMS: Well, we place first in this paragraph (c) the suggestion of encouraging Canadian artists and musicians and those folks -- we have quite a few of them -- who in any way need support. That is why we speak about bursaries to such people.

The second point we make is competition with adequate financial prizes which would produce

big results in the field of music, drama and so on.

Then, the final point is the establishment of a system where artists and writers and musicians receive training; and I think the C.B.C. is doing a part of that in its own realm.

THE CHAIRMAN: They may be doing a certain amount incidentally, which is maybe all you are saying, but is this, in your serious contention, a legitimate and proper function of the C.B.C., or where does it stop?

MR. SIMS: We believe that the C.B.C. could, with profit to themselves and the country, tackle that very important problem.

THE CHAIRMAN: You don't feel that it should be for the creative artists and musicians to produce the work and, if they are good enough, the C.B.C. buys them?

MR. SIMS: I think until that "Through many a gem of purest rays serene the dark unfathomed field of ocean bears . . ." the C.B.C., as the greatest single cultural institution in the country, has a duty to Canadians in that sense, not simply to depend upon those who have won their place but to organize for the "gems". That is possible of development.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Do you not think that the C.B.C., by its very existence, has done the very thing that you suggest? Up to September, 1952, there was no television in the country, and by the very fact that the C.B.C. has

begun to produce programmes it has developed producers and script writers. Presumably by employing them it has given them encouragement. Aside from the bursaries that you suggest it has acted as a school of training by the fact that it has existed.

Do you think there is really a need to further supplement that by further expenditure? It has done the very thing you are suggesting.

MR. SIMS: We agree, and we say on page 4:

"... about 7,000 Canadian artists

"appeared on CBC-TV ..."

and some of them have produced work -- I am thinking here of "Holiday Ranch" which, for \$5,000 a week is better, in our opinion, than some of the programmes produced at a cost of \$100,000; that is one example. But we think that you have to look ahead. Much more could be done and should be done than is being done.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't mean to over-emphasize that one point on page 7, but I just wondered how important you regarded it.

MR. COYNE: In your opening presentation you emphasize the desirability of arranging exchanges of programmes, and so encouraging reciprocity, and I presume you would recommend encouraging the export of Canadian programmes generally; and then on page 11 you suggest that consideration be given to measures to increase the taxes upon imported T.V. and radio programmes and material. Aren't these ideas mutually exclusive? In other

word, if you advocate the placing of a Canadian tariff on the importation of programmes, aren't you simply encouraging other countries to impose equivalent tariffs on Canadian programmes and, therefore, defeating your aim to encourage reciprocity and the export of Canadian programmes?

MR. SIMS: Well, as we understand it, a kine show like "Dragnet" -- it pays Customs Duty of \$2.45 a foot when it comes in. It costs about \$3,000 for the show and \$4,000 for the time. That is one fact.

The other is that our information is -- and it may not be fully accurate -- that about 7 Canadian shows have appeared on American networks in the last couple of years. The most famous was the CBC-TV recording of the Coronation. Something has got to be done to rectify that balance.

MR. COYNE: Yes; but if you imposed a tariff on the importation of "Dragnet", say, related to cost of production, or the cost of importing it, wouldn't you just be defeating your other aim? Wouldn't the Americans turn round and impose an equivalent tariff on Canadian programmes?

MR. SIMS: Well, it is like the man that made the pie of one elephant and one rabbit! It is the situation now that there must be 95% of American material coming in here and only 5% of Canadian material going to the United States.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the point that has been put to us is that there may be a way of

increasing our market, in effect, by exporting our productions to other countries ---

MR. SIMS: On a reciprocal basis.

THE CHAIRMAN: Never mind whether it is on a reciprocal basis. You increase the market if you export whether it is reciprocal or not. You spread your costs over a larger audience which, in effect, will be paying for them.

I think Mr. Coyne's question is that if there is anything in that objective of exporting radio and T.V. programmes -- if there is anything in that -- you don't encourage the export by putting a tariff on your imports.

MR. SIMS: I don't think that is the situation that Canada faces, though.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why not?

MR. SIMS: Because if you look again at that week we mentioned, the 20th to 26th, you will find that 7 out of 10 -- 70% -- of the key feature sports of T.V. -- and this is C.B.C., mind you -- the private T.V. stations would be even higher than that -- the main sports are represented by American productions.

MR. COYNE: Would you say -- is this your point -- that we should refuse to import any American films -- any American programmes -- except to the extent that the Americans wish to see Canadian programmes?

MR. SIMS: No, I don't say that you could do it that way, but I do state, as we state

in our brief, that consideration should be given to reviewing the tariff situation so as to give the Canadian producer of programmes a better chance.

Secondly, there should be more work done to convince our American neighbours that it would be an act of good neighbourliness to be more reciprocal. It is a two-way proposition.

MR. COYNE: I suppose part of the answer is that we want to see their programmes and they have no interest in ours.

MR. SIMS: I don't think that it is quite like that, although that is partly true.

MR. COYNE: Again, on page 11, you say in your fourth paragraph:

"Considering the service rendered to
"privately-owned T.V. and radio
"stations by C.B.C. ..."

I am just wondering what you have in mind as to the service rendered to private stations by C.B.C.?

MR. SIMS: Well, we are thinking there of the 40 hours of sustaining and commercial programmes of the C.B.C. at the moment -- and I am using C.B.C. figures supplied to the private stations.

MR. COYNE: Would you say that the private stations are also providing a service to the C.B.C. by acting as outlets for these national programmes in areas where there are no C.B.C. outlets?

MR. SIMS: Well, that is the theory of the Canadian Broadcasting Act, and that is the

system we have in the country.

MR. COYNE: So you would agree that there is reciprocity?

MR. SIMS: But it is often violated. Last Friday night, for instance, there was an important C.B.C. sustaining programme on international politics -- "Press Conference". I made a check of a few of the private T.V. stations, including the Hamilton station. They all had an American film on.

I think that Mr. Dunton has stated before this Commission that already problems are arising which go in the same direction. For instance, today I don't think there is a private T.V. station in Canada that is using 5 hours of C.B.C. sustaining programmes.

MR. COYNE: Then, you would say, in effect, that the C.B.C. is not rendering very much service to the private T.V. stations?

MR. SIMS: No. I think that without the T.V. service at the present time in regard to the commercial programmes, where the private T.V. station gets 75% and the C.B.C. 25%, they know that they couldn't exist. In addition to that they get, I think, 23 hours of sustaining programmes, or they can have it, without which they couldn't produce the service they are producing.

MR. COYNE: I don't understand your 75% and 25% figures.

MR. SIMS: The income -- the advertising income. In other words, the C.B.C., in national

network advertising, acts as the organizer and producer. The private station, either by kinescope or by direct relay gets 75% of the profit of the advertising income. They have a very nice set-up here so far as I can see.

MR. COYNE: They get considerably less, so I have been told.

MR. SIMS: I am simply reading what has been stated here and in C.B.C. reports. But the point is that Mr. Dunton here on one or two occasions, and in Parliament, to the Special Committee on Broadcasting this year, already indicated the pressure of money on the spot proposition. WGR Buffalo is typical of that. I think it is the T.V. station within the Toronto area where you can see the dangers that we face. If they run a film it may be good or it may not, but they will run into this one film not less than 18 spots; and they will often have the whole film sponsored by some advertiser, on the same trend of CKEY and the privately-owned radio stations that Mr. Cooke was speaking about here yesterday.

MR. COYNE: In those circumstances why do so many people in Toronto look at WGR?

MR. SIMS: Well, I have heard lots of arguments on that, and that question was asked of Mr. Dunton at the Special Committee on Broadcasting by Mr. Fleming, Member of Parliament for Eglinton, and Mr. Allard gave the answer. The rating was about 60% American stations and 38 to 40 CBLT. I think that is a tribute to the high cultural

level of the Canadian people -- and it is not a matter of pride about it. If 60% of the people of the Toronto area tune in on American stations, well, that is that; but the main factor is that CBLT has been able, in spite of the difficulties it has, to win 30 or 40% of the people. That is the biggest factor.

Then, the other: Mr. Allard answers this question by stating that taste is a matter of individuality. Well, that is true, too, but that isn't the problem here. The problem here is that the Canadian Broadcasting Act laid down for the C.B.C. the specific commitment of having a national radio system in the first place, now a national T.V. system, and it is not in any spirit of hostility to the American people that we place our position for a stronger fight for those things that the Canadian people want. I can't predict what their specific wants will be in three, four or five years, but I would emphasize that the C.B.C. is doing a very fine job in the fight, as you mentioned; and I can't, of course, nor can anybody, take the position where we will tell the people what station they will tune in on.

MR. COYNE: You say that the people should receive what they want; but wouldn't you say, from the figures you give, that more than 60% of the people don't want the C.B.C.?

MR. SIMS: I do not agree with that at all. I am not taking the Elliott-Haynes

statistics just as they are. I think that their main operation is to serve the advertising interests. The main point of our brief and our position is that, providing the Commission and the Government would back up the general, long-range programmes that the C.B.C. has put forth, a lot of these things could be done. The C.B.C. would not only have a bigger audience here in Canada, but would have a great influence upon the United States.

Everybody doesn't agree, for instance, with a statement made by Mr. Knight of, I think, Saskatoon. He said on May 13th, in the Special Committee discussion on this particular question of quality:

"If the standard of television in the

"United States goes on deteriorating I

"think there will be a lot of people

"prepared to pay in order not to see it."

I myself think there should be a way by which we could pay a little extra and get the thing to stop. I am quite serious about this, because I have noticed that a good many organizations in the United States are getting together in order to try to protect themselves against television.

MR. COYNE: Of course, Mr. Knight has the advantage of living in Saskatoon, and there he cannot receive American programmes anyway.

MR. STEWART: Nor C.B.C. programmes.

MR. SIMS: I have read every word of his report, and I think Mr. Knight made a fairly

good survey, and I think he had a few very fine conclusions, with the exception of "quality", and that is a purely personal opinion on his part; and there is another place -- and I am satisfied that there is a lot of truth in it -- he stated that private T.V. stations are more interested in selling services than in the culture the people are striving for. That is the task of the C.B.C., not to get down to the lowest level but to do everything it can to raise the level of culture.

(Page 3218 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: I just have a couple of questions to ask you, Mr. Sims. On page 7, you are talking about another one of these items that the CBC Board of Governors should be tackling.

"(e) Going forward with plans to introduce colour TV on CBC, without waiting for the United States." Isn't that a pretty ambitious programme you are suggesting, with regard to the extraordinary technical difficulties and finally the enormous cost?

MR. SIMS: We are pinning our flag upon the proposition of the CBC where they declare they can proceed.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think maybe the report gave the wrong impression, unless I got the wrong impression. I understood the CBC was saying to us if we went along in colour it would likely cost so much. I do not think they made the suggestion we should go ahead with colour first without waiting for the United States.

MR. SIMS: That might be poorly phrased because they have coloured TV in the States now in some places.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was just wondering. It seems to me this is expecting a relatively small country to achieve something in a highly expensive technological development for some reason apparently that we should not wait for the big and highly developed country to do it.

MR. SIMS: In many things Canada has shown

the way ahead to the United States.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would not doubt it.

MR. SIMS: In the newsprint industry we didn't have to wait.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but not too much with the increased technology.

MR. SIMS: We did not have to wait for them on that. I would think the technology of newsprint is just as tough as coloured TV even if the profits are not as big.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The next items I want to ask you about are on pages 11 and 12 where you are talking about single coverage policy with TV. I would like to know just exactly what this proposal is, because as I read it you say new licences for privately owned TV stations in metropolitan centres where there are stations now, your party favours dealing with each application for such licence upon its merits, and you go on to say:

"We favour a firm policy that would give priority for available TV channels to additional CBC TV outlets." And then, you favour granting licence to operate a privately owned station in a metropolitan area providing the CBC Board of Governors was satisfied it would develop Canadian talent and programming and observe CBC regulations in regard to advertising limits.

Would you mind expanding those three points just a little to indicate what you mean? I am

confused just a little between exactly what you recommend. You say first examine it on its merits, and then you say give TV additional outlets to CBC, and then you seem to favour granting a licence if they are satisfied the private operator will do an adequate amount of programming.

MR. SIMS: Well, Mr. Dunton in his memorandum added a few new factors that we were not aware of when we wrote this or discussed this. As I understand it, Mr. Dunton declared if the policy would be for the granting of private TV licences in the main metropolitan centres, the CBC would likely have to consider going into centres where private stations are already operating, which is a new factor, and which would be something that we could hardly deal with.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us take a situation like Toronto, right here where we are.

MR. SIMS: I was here last week when the Joint Labour Council presented its brief. I think our position would be about the same as theirs. We are very apprehensive of the intentions of the private TV people and Mr. Cooke and CFRB, and I think that at the minute our party would take the position that would be quite similar to that of the general labour movement of the country, and be in favour of the CBC having the franchised outlet in the main metropolitan centres.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us take Toronto now. We have already got one TV outlet here.

MR. SIMS: Six.

THE CHAIRMAN: What?

MR. SIMS: We have six.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Two.

MR. SIMS: I am speaking of the American stations, Hamilton.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes. As I gather, you are suggesting if the second channel available in Toronto was licensed and used, it should be used by the CBC?

MR. SIMS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: So that you would have two CBC stations operating here, TV stations. Isn't that going to introduce very serious problems of programming?

MR. SIMS: Well, it might, but it would not be any different in the programmes that CJBC and CBLT have on radio except they have alternate radio programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: As I understand it, the main purpose of the second of the CBC radio stations is in order to act as the government-owned station in the second network, the Dominion network, but until we reach a stage in Canada where there can be two television networks, we have not got that same kind of factor applying.

MR. SIMS: Well, I think that your Commission would be able to give a stronger recommendation in that regard than we could. It has not been spelled out to the Commission as far as I know, but I think this figure has got some bearing

upon the problem. In 1954, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics the total sum of money spent on advertising in Canada was \$395,053,843. Now, it was referred to in the Special Committee on Broadcasting in the House.

THE CHAIRMAN: What year was that?

MR. SIMS: That was 1954. Those are the last figures I could get, and there was about \$40 million of that spent on radio and TV.

Now, in 1955 that figure doubled. We are not in the position of the United States, but the trend is in that direction. In the United States, from 1950 to 1956 the national product increased by 143 per cent; industrial production increased by 128 per cent; employment increased by 108 per cent, and advertising increased by 163 per cent, which is disproportionate.

I have not figures for Canada that the same trends are working here, but that is why at the CARTB convention here not long ago, the main speaker there, the president and manager of Proctor & Gamble Soap Company of Canada said:

"Advertising does not cost money but actually saves it," and that is a theory which I think is wrong.

I believe that has a bearing upon the question of whether your Commission would recommend a private TV licence be granted in the main metropolitan centres, because there would be a great danger there that there would be an excessive

emphasis on advertising. Particularly, when you consider the difference between the rates for TV and radio.

That problem has been raised, and I know there are some very serious problems in places like Vancouver where they say about half a million dollars a year goes to the United States. Windsor has the same problem. I do not think the Commission would believe in giving Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver and other main centres TV stations; it would do a lot of harm, and Mr. Dunton's proposal -- there were quite a few variations of the way to solve the problem which included an alternate TV operated by the CBC where a combination would be made for renting time on that for private business.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just wanted a little explanation on that portion of the brief.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Just one question. In the course of your opening remarks, I think you said that the Regulations of the CBC were administered to service CARTB. I wonder if you would like to expand on that a bit?

MR. SIMS: I have no recollection of saying that the Regulations of CBC were administered to serve CARTB.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: That is how I have it down here. I may have misunderstood it.

MR. SIMS: I put it this way, that the regulations which flow from the Canadian Broadcasting Act of 1936, charge the Board of Governors

with applying them and point the way to promote and ensure greater use of Canadian talent, and then, the limitation of the length of advertising message of programmes.

The general feeling we have is that those regulations have not been enforced. We would not state that there was a deliberate policy on the part of CBC to apply those regulations for CARTB. I think there is a problem, but we see no reason why those regulations both in regard to talent and limitation of advertising should not be enforced. That was the point I was trying to make.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you both for presenting the brief for our consideration.

- - - - -

SUBMISSION OF
THE LUTHERAN HOUR

Appearances:

Rev. Horace H. Erdman

Rev. C. T. Wetzstein

- - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: Next is the brief of The Lutheran Hour, with Rev. Horace H. Erdman and Rev. C. T. Wetzstein. Are you going to present this brief, Mr. Erdman?

MR. ERDMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will begin by marking it Exhibit 129.

EXHIBIT NO. 129: Brief of The Lutheran Hour.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you have been here this afternoon and you know the procedure.

MR. ERDMAN: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you wish to read it, you may, and if you wish to summarize it you may, and if you wish to do some of both you may.

MR. ERDMAN: I think we will summarize. A great deal of this brief was made up of a declaration concerning what The Lutheran Hour is and what work it does. If I may refer to the first paragraph, today, twenty-six years after the first broadcast, The Lutheran Hour is transmitted in 63 countries and territories, in 54 languages and dialects, and over more than 1250 stations. The total operation of this programme demands an annual budget in excess of \$1,300,000.

In Canada this programme has been broadcast since 1930 over one station until it has increased today to 41 stations from coast to coast. This broadcast is supported by the members of the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod. I want to make clear that the Missouri Synod is not an organization which is restricted to the state of Missouri, but it is quite international in scope.

In Canada there are over three hundred congregations of this Synod in existence.

The Lutheran Laymen's League is a society organization made up of members of this organization, of the Lutheran Church Missouri

Synod in Canada. The Lutheran Church Missouri Synod is divided into three districts, Ontario district, and then one consisting of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and another one, of Alberta and British Columbia. These three districts are all incorporated in Canada, and we now, as a matter of fact, are working on a national charter. I am stating that to establish the fact that as we refer now to the item in the regulations which are No. 5(g), subsection (i), which states that no station shall broadcast except with the consent in writing of a representative of the Corporation any appeal for donations or subscriptions in money or kind on behalf of any persons, organizations other than -- now comes subsection (i) -- churches or religious bodies permanently established in Canada and serving the area covered by the station.

I refer to the fact that we as a church body are permanently established in Canada. As the regulation now appears to be, at least to us it is -- this is as is definitely -- as we have a statement that these regulations are designed to assist local churches in making an appeal for funds to further their work in the community in which the broadcasts are being made. In other words, if any appeal for funds is made it must be sent to an address in the community. Now, according to these regulations, we believe that it is possible also for consent to be given in writing of a representative of the Corporation that the funds may be

sent to another address. However, we did have this ruling from the manager of the broadcast regulations of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, stating we never permit appeals for funds on transcribed religious programmes prepared outside or inside Canada where listeners are invited to send a donation to some other point in Canada or out of the country. At least the interpretation of this regulation, or application of it, is that they now do give such permission.

Now, the point of this brief is -- I think it would perhaps be well for me to read it. This is on page 8:

"If no other change can be made with respect to Regulation 5(g), we respectfully request the Royal Commission on Broadcasting to show cause to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to amend paragraph (1) of Regulation 5(g) or to change the interpretation of said paragraph so that appeals for donations may be made on broadcasts designed for the religious benefit of all of Canada and in support of the work of 'religious bodies permanently established in Canada', particularly where all contributed funds are retained in Canada for the support of religious work in Canada. According to a possible

interpretation of Regulation 5(g), a local congregation or parish serving in the area covered by the station on which a programme is aired could appeal for funds. If this interpretation is possible, we submit that similar licence should be granted to Dominion-wide broadcasts which are representative of the work of 'churches and religious bodies permanently established in Canada', as for instance, The Lutheran Hour which is broadcast by an organization within a permanently established church, the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod."

I do not know if it is necessary for me even to say that naturally income from listeners will increase, if we are able to make an appeal, even if it is of a very limited nature, because from time to time we do receive letters from listeners asking us if we would accept donations. Then, too, quite a number of members of the Lutheran Church need a little urging now and then, like a local congregation, if nothing is ever said about having to give now and then, the offering of the people does decrease.

THE CHAIRMAN: You do not suggest this characteristic is confined to the members of the Lutheran Church?

MR. ERDMAN: No, I do not suggest that.

I think that is unfortunately quite general.

That, briefly, is the submission of our brief and the summary thereof.

MR. de GRANDPRE: When referring to The Lutheran Hour, when these broadcasts are presented can you tell us if they are prepared and produced by The Lutheran Hour without the technical assistance of the CBC, or the private station, or are these programmes prepared in co-operation and with the technical assistance of the broadcasting station?

MR. ERDMAN: These recordings are prepared by our organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: Where?

MR. ERDMAN: The bulk of them, they are made in the United States. However, we do also mention that on special occasions, such as national holidays, where the message should contain references to the conditions in the country and the history of the country, or whatever holiday is being celebrated at that time, the message is delivered by a Canadian pastor.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And these recordings are then broadcast on a local station on time purchased by The Lutheran Hour Missouri Synod?

MR. ERDMAN: That is correct.

MR. de GRANDPRE: When you make these broadcasts on a local station, then you are entitled to make an appeal for funds?

MR. ERDMAN: Not, sir, if the funds are to be sent to our head office. You see, we have an

office in Edmonton, Alberta, and another central office in Kitchener, Ontario. As we broadcast it would be most difficult to say to the people in Toronto, "Send funds to an address in Toronto", then in Kitchener, "Send it to Kitchener", or if it is Kingston, "Send it to Kingston". That is what is required by the present regulations and application thereof. We are not permitted to say, "Please send, if you have an offering to make, we will appreciate it if you will send it to Kitchener". We are not permitted to do that.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Can you send it care of the station on which you are broadcasting?

MR. ERDMAN: I am sorry, I do not know exactly whether that can be done. I suppose it could be done.

MR. de GRANDPRE: What I want to find out, if you tried to obtain the consent in writing of the CBC before?

MR. ERDMAN: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: In putting out the programme were you told that you had violated the regulation after the broadcast?

MR. ERDMAN: During the summer of 1955, and this is when Pastor Wetzstein was in Europe, and I took over, and some how or other they made an appeal for funds -- I think it was being done quite generally -- and the organization was told definitely then this could not be done by sending it to a central office.

MR. WETZSTEIN: The various stations were informed, as I understand, by CBC, and they in turn wrote to us and said we would have to eliminate that certain portion which was very brief. It went like this, "You are invited to send your free will gift and offering for support of this programme to Lutheran Hour, Kitchener", and that had to be deleted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are these programmes sponsored by a church or religious body in the local community, or is it done by the whole Lutheran Hour organization?

MR. WETZSTEIN: By the Lutheran Laymen's League. It is a laymen's organization within the Church and they are sponsoring this programme throughout America and in Canada, and we have this Lutheran Laymen's League in Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia.

MR. ERDMAN: They send their contributions. As a matter of fact, all membership contributions of this organization in Canada are sent to our office in Kitchener or in Edmonton for use for this purpose. So, it is a co-operative matter among a number of organizations and our congregations have special collections, or they put it in their budget to contribute, so instead of having them contribute locally we pool our resources and put them on in various places. We do try to put on a number of the broadcasts over stations where the population is rather sparse, where people don't have an opportunity to attend the church regularly,

such as Northern Ontario and other areas in Western Canada. Our purpose is not only to serve the sections where there are established churches, but also to bring this religious message to parts of Canada where the population is sparse.

MR. de GRANDPRE: In other words, what you would like to see is the deletion of the words, "and serving the area covered by the station"?

MR. ERDMAN: Yes, sir.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Your argument being that if it is good locally, it is good nationally?

MR. ERDMAN: That is true.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just before you leave that, and talking not for a second about the merits of the Lutheran Church or its beliefs, but as a general matter of these regulations, are there not some dangers to be avoided by regulations, in your opinion, in this field?

MR. ERDMAN: Yes, sir, I think we are just as interested in preventing some individual from using religion or a religious broadcast to make money for himself as anyone. We trust that the religious bodies permanently established in Canada -- as you have the Anglican Church, the United Church and the Lutheran Church, which are recognized bodies in Canada, and it may be some way of drawing up the regulation so that it would mean that some yardstick would be used to prevent some individual taking advantage of it.

MR. de GRANDPRE: As you have pointed out

in your brief, there is a reason for the regulation; you pointed out at the bottom of page 7 when you say:

"We realize that Regulation 5(g), and particularly paragraph (i) of that regulation, is designed to safeguard the Canadian public against exploitation . . ."

MR. ERDMAN: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Even if we adopt for the purposes of discussion the suggested amendment, or the deletion of the last words of 5(g)(i), could it not be argued, and with merit, that if you leave only the words "bodies permanently established in Canada" then you put the new churches or new denominations in an unfavourable position?

MR. ERDMAN: Yes, I see your point there, that there would be the difficulty of saying, "Does the one congregation entitle a national broadcast or not?" However, we do feel that if there are such cases it may be that a certain number of congregations would be required in the provinces. Unfortunately, it is rather difficult to say just exactly how it could be done, but we are trying to stress that where there are congregations of an organization across Canada, that if they are permitted to do it locally, we should do it co-operatively, and if there are not enough to co-operate, if there are only one or two, they may be restricted to the area in which they are actually

represented.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you happen to know if this issue has come up before the Religious Advisory Council of the CBC?

MR. ERDMAN: We have the chairman of that Council present this afternoon, and perhaps he can tell us.

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE N.R.A.C.: No, the organization has not contacted the Council either through its representative or through the organization officially for opinions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Apart from that could you tell us whether this question of regulation 5(g)(i) including the words "and serving the area covered by the station" has been considered by your Advisory Council or not?

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE N.R.A.C.: Yes, the religious department of the CBC, through Mr. Dunlop, informed us that the private stations were being notified of this regulation because there were some abuses of the privilege on the part of individuals across the nation, and Mr. Dunlop at that time said unfortunately certain programmes will suffer because of the abuse of certain individuals, and I believe this is one of the programmes that suffered because of the abuse.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see, thank you.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I have no further questions.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Do you have to pay for all the time you get on your private stations, or

do you sometimes get some time free?

MR. ERDMAN: We get no free time. We pay for all time on radio.

MR. WETZSTEIN: I have been connected with The Lutheran Hour for seventeen years, first in the West and then in the East, and we have paid for our way all the way -- every station.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Have you ever tried to secure free time?

MR. WETZSTEIN: No. We have received consideration where we continue year after year; they will give us a reduced rate or a flat rate, but we haven't asked for anything gratis.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Because I can see why you want donations -- in order to pay for the broadcast time, but if the stations gave you the broadcast time, you wouldn't need the donations?

MR. WETZSTEIN: Well, there would be very few who would do that.

MR. ERDMAN: I may say also in that respect we do encourage local congregations, through their pastor, to take advantage of free time that stations may offer, and they will offer a certain amount of free time, and we have a feeling that the local congregations should have the privilege of using that free time. We don't want to go in and take away free time on a national basis that we feel should belong to the local group.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Therefore, local congregations sometimes get free time?

MR. ERDMAN: That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: But not for this particular
Hour?

MR. ERDMAN: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, this is a very specific
point, and you have stated it. This same point has
come up in other places throughout Canada, and in
quite a different context -- this whole regulation.

MR. ERDMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

MR. ERDMAN: We wish to thank you, Mr.
Chairman.

- - - - -

SUBMISSION OF
THE NURSERY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO

Appearances:

Miss Ethel Stevens

Mrs. William Foster

Miss Margaret Fletcher

- - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is from
The Nursery Education Association of Ontario. Miss
Ethel Stevens is to present the brief and I think
she has some associates with her. We will mark
the brief as Exhibit No. 130, and would you tell us
whom you have with you.

EXHIBIT NO. 130: Brief of The Nursery Education Association of Ontario.

MISS STEVENS: I have with me Miss Margaret Fletcher and Mrs. William Foster.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, would you care to read the brief, or present it as you choose?

MISS STEVENS: Yes, it is a fairly brief one, so perhaps if I just read it it will be simpler.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that will be fine.

MISS STEVENS: "The Nursery Education Association of Ontario is a non-profit organization, incorporated in 1952, and responsible by charter to the Province of Ontario. Its primary interests and concerns lie in the welfare and education of the pre-school child. It has affiliated groups in Toronto, North York, Ottawa, Kingston, Hamilton, London, St. Catharines, Windsor, Sarnia and the Lakehead. Membership includes principally parents, educators, social workers, doctors and nurses; but is open to all wishing to promote the well-being of young children.

"Its specific aims are:

1. To make known to parents and the general public the value of nursery education.
2. To help parents and others to understand the needs of young children and how to meet them through the encouragement of study groups and by other suitable means.

"The Nursery Education Association

endeavours to promote, sponsor and direct projects aimed at the establishment of pre-school groups, play centres, out-of-school activities, and also to work with handicapped and hospitalized children.

"The Television Committee of the Nursery Education Association notes with great satisfaction that the Special Committee on Broadcasting of the House of Commons is of the opinion that Canadian Broadcasting should give expression to Canadian ideas and aspirations; and, that the grant of exclusive use of certain channels shall continue to be under the control of the Parliament of Canada; and, that the broadcasting and distribution of Canadian programmes by a public agency shall continue to be Canadian broadcasting policy.

"This Committee realizes that the Royal Commission is primarily concerned with financial policy, and believes that in the expenditure of public moneys on a powerful mass medium, that is, television, it has within its power the means to introduce young children to an awareness of the world beyond their own immediate family, and to the best in Canadian culture.

"To this end, the Committee urges that any expenditure on Children's Programmes should include the employment of advisers familiar with the developmental needs and interests of young children in order to achieve the stated

aims of the Royal Commission.

"This Committee is of the unanimous opinion that the best Canadian television programmes for young children are already enriching the imagination, intellect and activity of young viewers, particularly those developing a sense of constructive interest, and satisfying as well as stimulating the insistent curiosity of young children. But, the Committee believes the number of such programmes should be greatly increased.

"In order to emphasize and illustrate these statements this Committee respectfully submits the following comments:

- (a) That standards of Children's television programmes be evaluated by experts in the field of early childhood, as well as by experts in production.
- (b) That in planning future policy, the timing of programmes be given consideration in relation to daily routines usually observed in the average home.
- (c) That children's programmes be wholesome in the sense of being free from the presentation of anxiety producing situations, violence, hostility, slapstick, the distortion of human relationships, and features arousing strong and turbulent emotional sensations.
- (d) That programmes be directed toward the

promotion of activities in which the children can participate and have a continuing interest and enjoyment, that is, singing, music, crafts, natural history, folklore and the everyday life of the community.

"Finally, this Committee wishes to express the opinion that Children's Television Programmes can become a most effective agent in the promotion of good mental health at a most impressionable age in the lives of young Canadians."

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Miss Stevens. Do you want to add anything, or do any of your associates wish to add anything at the present time?

MISS STEVENS: No.

MISS FLETCHER: You may have a few questions.

MR. COYNE: Miss Stevens, you refer to the pre-school child, and in the body of your brief you refer to "young children": what are the age limits that you have in mind?

MISS STEVENS: We have in mind the children really prior to them entering the formal all-day school. We consider, maybe, around three to six, and I don't think we need to consider under three years old.

MR. COYNE: Say, three, four and five?

MISS STEVENS: Approximately.

MR. COYNE: Do you feel that so-called children's programmes appeal to the whole range of

childhood, or are you suggesting that there should be specific programmes directed to the four and five year old age group?

MISS STEVENS: Yes, we feel there should be programmes directed to what we call the pre-schooler -- three to six level. We feel that there are some good children's programmes, but they pretty well are geared to the school age child.

MR. COYNE: When you say the Committee believes the number of such programmes should be greatly increased, you are thinking of the number of programmes that are directed towards the pre-school child?

MISS STEVENS: Yes, that is right.

MR. COYNE: I would like to ask you whether you have any specific ideas as to what extent the number of such programmes should be greatly increased, and the reason I am interested is this, that, as you are aware, the number of television stations and the amount of television time is severely limited, and I am wondering whether, if you want to greatly increase the number of programmes directed to this group of three, four, five or six, is there not some danger of interfering with the programmes that are directed to the young school child, the older school child, and not to mention the adults as well? What sort of range of increase or amount of time did you have in mind?

MISS STEVENS: I don't think we had any actual specific time in that. It was more that

most of these programmes now running for the younger child are geared to the school age child and not to the pre-schooler.

MR. COYNE: It is out of balance at the moment, is it?

MISS STEVENS: Yes, that is right.

MR. COYNE: Is there a possibility that programmes for this group could be developed during day-time hours at times which would not be appropriate for the school age child?

MISS STEVENS: Yes, it would be possible to put them on during school hour times, when pre-school children would not be at school.

MR. COYNE: That may be one way of avoiding interfering with the other programmes?

MISS STEVENS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps it may lead to a longer operating day.

MR. COYNE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. On page 3 you say:

"Programmes should be directed towards the promotion of activities in which the children can participate and have a continuing interest and enjoyment."

What do you mean? Do you mean participation in programmes, or during the time of the programmes, or stimulating activities?

MISS STEVENS: Both.

MR. COYNE: Both?

MISS STEVENS: Yes. A young pre-school child, I believe I am right in saying, will not just sit and look. There needs to be some encouragement in them actually participating. We can think of one example of Ding Dong School.

MRS. FOSTER: Programmes such as that will suggest all kinds of activities which can be carried on after, and are particularly valuable if it is suggested to parents, but the child also carries on from leads.

MR. COYNE: You suggest that children's programmes be wholesome in the sense of being free from the presentation of anxiety-producing situations, violence, hostility, slapstick, the distortion of human relationships, and features arousing strong and turbulent emotional sensations. As far as the present programmes are concerned, do you feel that they are wholesome in this sense, or not?

MISS FLETCHER: That is pretty hard to answer in a general way. Every day there are really excellent programmes, usually from four to five-thirty or so. Again, these are geared to the older children, and it seems that the cartoons perhaps include those things we think may be harmful for the very young child; because these programmes are geared to the older children we find or we think that the little children are going to watch them anyway, and the older child, perhaps even the crime stories and so on, they are going to watch them, whereas a programme which is an excellent programme

for an older child includes those things which the younger child from three to six, who is just beginning to understand, becomes confused with the meaning. It is not that we must say that the programmes provided now are not good, because they are, but because they are geared to an older age level, the younger child becomes confused and cannot sort out the unreal and the hostility.

MR. COYNE: If the programme is satisfactory for the older child and should therefore be put on the air, isn't it the only solution for the younger child to be kept away from the programme, otherwise you would be depriving the other child?

MRS. FOSTER: Well, the younger child should be offered something.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, are you sure?

MRS. FOSTER: Some studies have shown that five and six year old is one of the most ardent viewers -- fives.

THE CHAIRMAN: Suppose they are: can any system of television, public or private, supply all the needs of all the people?

MRS. FOSTER: But you can meet his need some of the time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it reasonable to expect that any system can provide an adequate supply of programmes for the three to six year old group of children?

MRS. FOSTER: But you can meet his needs some of the time, for a little bit of the time --

something suitable.

MISS FLETCHER: I would like to ask you, Mr. Fowler, if, when you say "Do you think it is necessary?", have you not found that the younger child from three to six is going to watch television?

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, I think so, but he may do a lot of other things along with older children that he doesn't quite understand. You can't really introduce all educational features into it.

MISS FLETCHER: No, but parents both in the Association and out of it, so many of them come to us with the feeling that they are really getting so little of the space that is given for children's programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I don't want to give you any impression that I am unsympathetic, personally. I can well understand your interest.

MISS FLETCHER: You have a large family yourself, haven't you?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I have almost a personal survey going all the time.

MRS. FOSTER: Could I say that the trouble of the parent with the pre-school child is in offering him a substitute -- "No, this is not for you to see, but here is one for you to see", and that we should give him some time.

THE CHAIRMAN: I can well understand the way your Association would be interested in having programmes for the age group in which you are particularly interested; that is natural enough. I

am only raising the question as to whether or not all age groups can be served in a practical way by a television system such as we have? There is only so much, and it has to be divided up somehow, and whether this is a group that should be a primary concern of the television system -- this is the question I am raising.

MISS STEVENS: Well, we are primarily concerned -- we do feel there is proportionately more given to the school age child, to the older child, than there is to the pre-schooler.

MR. COYNE: You feel there should be some balance?

MISS STEVENS: Some time given to the pre-schooler.

MR. COYNE: Without suggesting that it should be a large amount of time which would interfere with the other age groups?

MISS STEVENS: Quite.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are only raising the general problem because, as Mr. Coyne says, there is only so much time and only so much money, or presumably only so much money, and you have got not only different occupational groups in the country, such as farmers, labour folk and a lot of others in the separate groups, and the Maritimes, West, East, North, South, but also have different age groups, and there must be a limit somewhere to what any broadcasting programme can use. It is subdivided too many times.

MISS FLETCHER: In the programmes as listed for one week, twelve of them, there is scarcely one between four to five-thirty every afternoon.

THE CHAIRMAN: And those programmes were what?

MISS FLETCHER: They are nearly all geared to the older age level except perhaps Maggie Muggins. The parents who came to us felt that their children were watching programmes that had not been thought of in terms of the younger children and were entirely for the older children.

THE CHAIRMAN: To what extent do you think it does the child any harm to look at the older programme? It may not make quite as much impression on him, but do you think there is any harm in it?

MISS FLETCHER: I think if they cannot understand it, it is not very valuable to them.

MRS. FOSTER: Yes, I feel that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there anything in the older children's programmes to which you object specifically as to their impact on younger children, or is it merely that they don't follow them?

MISS FLETCHER: I don't know, personally, what to say about the cowboy pictures. I think all ages seem to like them.

MRS. FOSTER: The fact is that since they don't find satisfaction in those, they turn to cowboy pictures which are the only alternative.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Do the little girls like the cowboy pictures, too?

MISS FLETCHER: Certainly. I would like

to ask the Commission about such programmes from the States as Ding Dong School, which seems to have such an extraordinary reception -- Captain Kangaroo, and things like that.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are getting into a field I don't know much about.

MISS FLETCHER: Those are geared to the younger children, but we haven't anything like that here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I think it is important for us to consider these matters. You will realize that I don't think this Commission is going to set itself up as being an expert on this, that or the other thing. That is beyond our Terms of Reference. Have you any questions?

MR. COYNE: No, I have finished, Mr. Chairman.

MISS STEVENS: I would like to reiterate the purposes in our brief where we feel that there should be an advisory group in connection with any planning of programmes for young children.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean that as a formal advisory group to CBC?

MR. COYNE: : And that is what you mean at the bottom of page 2;

"Standards of children's television programmes be evaluated by experts in the field of early childhood, as well as by experts in production"?

MISS STEVENS: Yes, and also right in the middle of the second paragraph on page 2:

"To this end, the Committee urges that any expenditure on children's programmes should include the employment of advisers familiar with the developmental needs and interests of young children in order to achieve the stated aims of the Royal Commission."

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to be clear on this: your Committee does not have any major objection to existing programmes for children. You would merely like to have more programmes that would be geared to the pre-school age?

MISS STEVENS: Or a proportion of the present programming for children.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but it is not the fact that there is something in the present programming system which you feel is bad or dangerous?

MISS STEVENS: Not the ones we are familiar with.

(Page 3250 follows)

SUBMISSION OF
THE CANADIAN TEMPERANCE FEDERATION

Appearances:

Rev. John Linton

- - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is that of the Canadian Temperance Federation and Reverend John Linton, the General Secretary, is appearing. We will mark this brief as Exhibit No. 131.

EXHIBIT NO. 131: Brief of The Canadian Temperance Federation.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe you have followed our procedure here; you may present the brief either by summarization or by reading it, as seems best to you.

MR. LINTON: I would like to thank you for the privilege of meeting before you and to emphasize some of the topics.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before I interrupt you, would you introduce the people who are with you?

MR. LINTON: The first part will be explained by Mrs. Lang; Mr. Moulton is from the Ontario Temperance Federation; the Reverend G. W. Porter is our president, and Mr. Yonke is representing the Baptists. We have communications from the Canadian Council of Catholic Bishops in agreement with our brief, and we had here earlier a representative of the Anglican Church but he had to leave. I think as far as the brief is concerned it is in

your hands and we will not read it all. The first page is partly introductory, giving our objectives, and we go on to mention our general concern about this problem. We believe that the publicly owned broadcasting system has made an immense contribution to our Canadian national unity.

Referring to the control, the Canadian Temperance Federation affirms its support of the present system of control in Canada. We believe that broadcasting is a natural monopoly and it must be conducted and regulated in the public interest. We would emphasize that there is just one system of broadcasting in this country and not two.

Speaking on finance, believing as we do that our national system of broadcasting is performing an invaluable service in the building of the Canadian nation, we feel it is entirely misleading to compare the operations of the CBC with those of a commercial enterprise. We are convinced that certain radio and television services are necessary to the well-being and we are of the opinion that these cannot be supplied commercially or on an ordinary profit and loss basis. CBC programme planning should not be governed by the purely financial considerations which might influence a private enterprise.

Then, secondly, because of the extremely high cost of television production, the matter of public support is most important in this newer field. The possible revenue to be derived from commercial sponsorship of TV programmes is a very

large consideration and under the present circumstances it may be necessary for the CBC to seek such revenue. We hold that the CBC should be as free as possible from the pressure to secure advertising accounts.

Thirdly, on methods of financing the CBC, the Federation has only some general comments to make. We take the stand that substantial government support from tax funds should not be viewed as an emergency measure, but should be seen as a continuing policy. The Federation is strongly of the opinion that the revenue to be made available from government sources should be determined several years in advance so that long-term planning on the part of the CBC would be practical.

As to advertising in general, we note that the Massey Report saw a tremendous growth in radio advertising and was concerned, feeling that this development had gone too far. We are not opposed to advertising as a principle, realizing that our present economy needs advertising as a means of distributing its goods. I was reading recently something which suggests that a venture is going to be made in the future in which a lady can stay at home and see the goods and order them, and all sorts of things. We do feel that advertising must be kept at a minimum and that it in no way should bring pressure to bear on programme or policy. The BBC has always retained from its very beginning its programme content for the simple

reason it did not have advertising to consider. In the United States of America the advertising group arranged almost everything. We understand that the BBC in its new situation of allowing advertising still retains control of content. We are glad to learn that in Canada the CBC TV tends towards the English pattern. In this way we believe the CBC can keep free of entanglements that would lead to strangulation of freedom and independence.

Regarding advertising in particular, we are interested in advertising by the liquor trade, both product and institutional. It is the opinion of The Canadian Temperance Federation that alcoholic beverages by their very nature cannot be treated as ordinary commodities. Viscount Astor has been quoted in Professor H. Levy's book "Drink" as saying:

"The drink trade differs from practically every other business which provides articles of consumption. It is to the interest of the community to increase and stimulate the consumption of milk, bread, etc. It is not to the interest of a community to stimulate and increase to the maximum the consumption of alcohol."

I am taking this quotation from the Bracken Report. The brewing industry has stated:

"It is axiomatic that it is

because of the potentialities of drunkenness -- that is unfortunately a corollary to the sale of alcohol -- that restrictions exist."

We feel that normal competitive sales conditions cannot be permitted to apply to liquor products. When Dr. E. M. Jellinek, adviser to W.H.O. on the alcohol problem, was asked about liquor advertising by the Bracken Commission in Winnipeg, he stated:

"If you allow advertising you might just as well give up the idea of monopoly, the two things do not go together. Monopoly aims to limit sales incentive; advertising aims at the opposite."

We agree with the recommendations made by the Bracken Commission to the Manitoba Government when it stated at the end of Chapter 21, a chapter given over entirely to the question of liquor advertising:

"1. That no advertising of liquor be permitted under any new legislation except such sign on brewery, distillery or winery premises, or on licensed premises, as may be permitted by the Liquor Control Commission.

"2. That institutional advertising by manufacturers or vendors of liquor be not permitted."

The CBC regulations for sound broadcasting stations clearly takes this ~~same~~ position except for the footnote to subsection (b), which we feel should be repealed.

We commend the CBC on the general level of its programmes in both education and entertainment. We feel that the use of drinking in such programmes must be kept to a level that is consistent with decency and true life experiences.

Too often drunkenness can be seen in a humourous vein. We note that through the development of a better understanding of the alcoholic this is not so true today as it was a few years ago. I was quite interested in noting the difference between the English film and the American film from Hollywood; Alcoholics Anonymous has become a very strong movement across Canada and the United States and has its influence in the films coming out from Hollywood, they are excellent and deal with the alcoholic. They no longer see the drunk as a clown or something to laugh at. They see the drunk as a problem, and we have had some very excellent films. You probably saw the most recent one, "I'll Cry Tomorrow". However, when you get a film from the Old Country like "Hobson's Choice" you see it in a humourous vein, and while it was a definite tragedy, a man's life was crashing, it was still done in a humourous vein.

We commend the CBC on the general level of its programmes in both education and entertainment.

We feel that the use of drinking in such programmes must be kept to a level that is consistent with decency and true life experience.

We especially commend the CBC for excellent programmes on the danger of drinking and driving. We trust that CBC TV may do more programmes like it's On the Spot series, when it dealt so ably with the problem of the alcoholic.

The third recommendation of the Bracken Commission;

"That the Provincial Government undertake a broad programme of education concerning alcohol and related problems; and that, in view of the inequity placed upon local publishers by the denial of liquor advertising, the Government utilize local newspapers and magazines in this undertaking and pay them for this service."

This suggests that the CBC in co-operation with provincial authorities work out a broad programme of education concerning alcohol and related problems. This would give to local stations revenue which would compensate them for any loss due to lack of liquor advertising, as well as performing a fine public service.

An earlier Commission said:

"The work with which we have been entrusted is concerned with nothing

less than the spiritual foundations of our national life. The quality of the Canadian mind and spirit will be determined by what Canadians think and think about; by the books they read, the pictures they see and the programmes they see and hear."

The way before us has tremendous possibilities for good or evil.. Those responsibilities will know many pressures; some of these pressures will be prompted by ignorance and greed. We believe that a broadcasting commission of objective, intelligent and consecrated persons is absolutely essential for our social and spiritual well-being.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. de Grandpre, have you any questions?

MR. de GRANDPRE: I see, Dr. Linton that your organization is in favour of a status quo in regard to the control of broadcasting; you are against an independent regulatory board?

MR. LINTON: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And do you also suggest that the positions now held by the CBC and the private stations and the Board of Governors should remain exactly the position in which they are today, or do you have suggestions for improvement for the relationship between private broadcasters and the CBC in this relationship which has been described to us as uneasy at times?

MR. LINTON: Well, we can see no reason why

we should grumble about the present situation. Naturally a year from now, or two years from now, things may change, but as at the moment we might say that there are times perhaps when the CBC might be wise in using some of the powers it already has a little more strongly, but that would not call for a change in policy.

MR. de GRANDPRE: For instance, it has been suggested to us by various organizations that the regulatory powers of the CBC should be performed by a department which would not be connected with the station relations; for instance, would you agree to such a change?

MR. LINTON: Well, I think that your Chairman, if I understand the Press right, if there was such a body that the private stations might find it a little more severe than at the present time.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I only asked that as a question; I asked them what they thought it would be, and this is a slightly different point, this is within the present organization of CBC. We are told that the stations relations department also looks after the enforcement of regulations and it has been suggested to us that it would be better to have these divided, and I am asking you whether you feel that that is so, or if you have given it any thought.

MR. LINTON: Well, we have not given it a great deal of thought because that is a matter of machinery, but looking at it in a very superficial manner we do not feel we want a separate regulatory

body.

MR. de GRANDPRE: We have one system of broadcasting in Canada and privately owned stations are the private outlets at certain points; the CBC network has not allowed the latter to become a national system, and you feel that in order to give this national service they should keep their powers and regulatory powers particularly?

MR. LINTON: I think so. I think in the Canadian situation we are in a unique situation as has been mentioned by many here, and we have adopted our own plan just as I say in accepting the best that is European and originating the worst that is American.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you feel that is wholly necessary for the CBC to keep all its regulatory powers to perform the function of being a national broadcasting system or could it still perform this function without keeping all these?

MR. LINTON: Well, the word "all" is very inclusive, and I am not too sure I would know what it meant.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I think I had better give you my full thought on this, the powers have been described to us and I think we can safely say that they fall into three different categories; there are the regulations dealing with the air waves and allotment of channels and things like that, which to some extent fall within the jurisdiction of the Department of Transport; you have powers dealing with network arrangements.

MR. LINTON: You would have to have the first, that is more or less set.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But do you feel that these powers should be with the CBC or should they remain with the Department of Transport?

MR. LINTON: They are at the moment with the Department of Transport.

-

-

(Page 3261 follows)

-

-

-

MR. de GRANDPRE: Except that CBC makes recommendations. According to the Act, CBC, according to Section 22 of the Canadian Broadcasting Act, have to recommend, as you know --

"The Minister of Transport shall, before dealing with any application for licence to establish a new private station or for increase of power, change of channel or change of location of any existing private station . . . refer such application to the Corporation",

and then,

"the Corporation shall give notice. . ."

and,

"and shall make such recommendation to the Minister of Transport as it may deem fit."

There is some responsibility on CBC when there is such an application made to the Department of Transport. Do you feel that this power of the CBC should be kept, for instance, or would you not prefer to have the applicant come before the Department of Transport and present his case and then the Department of Transport would listen to the other side of the story from the CBC, and from other interested parties, without having to refer for any recommendation to the CBC the application that it is now considering -- or then considering?

MR. LINTON: Of course, on a very

detailed point like that I would have to give my personal opinion; I can't speak for our organization. We didn't go into such thorough detail as that. We accepted the brief, that there at least be control of the radio situation and the television situation in Canada, and we saw no reason to disagree with the way it is at the moment. That is about all I can tell you.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have not gone as far as that into control?

MR. LINTON: No. If you want my own opinion, I would agree with the way it is at the moment, and in a democracy I think that would come back to the House -- the Federal Government.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But your Association as a group never went fully into this particular problem?

MR. LINTON: No.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You also touch the question of the methods of financing the CBC. Could you tell us whether you have discussed the various means which are at the disposal of the Government for financing the CBC, whether by excise taxes or licence fees, or any other means that you discussed?

MR. LINTON: No; the main thing we feel on the financing of the situation would be that everything should be done that is possible to keep the CBC as free as possible in its programming, in the type of programme, and that there would be no pressure upon it to slant its programming in any direction, and it would have freedom, and we thought

mainly in terms of freedom as far as financing was concerned, and we feel probably the best way for the CBC to be a true instrument in the democracy would be to receive its funds primarily from the people through the Government.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But you have not given any particular thought to the method?

MR. LINTON: No.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Referring to the last portion of your answer, there are, as you know, programmes of the entertainment nature and programmes which are more educational or cultural: do you feel it is necessary that the CBC should keep control of the content of the programmes which are strictly of the entertainment nature?

MR. LINTON: As far as the Canadian Temperance Federation is concerned, the point we would be interested in would be the matter of, say, the drinking scenes. Information came to us on fairly good authority in the United States that there was a fairly strong block in Hollywood where some people were fairly anxious that if a bottle was shown on a scene that it should be their brand, and it was a good subsidy when so done. We know the outstanding gangster of California, Samish, was recently put away for a while, and was a lobbyist in that area, and a very powerful lobbyist, and had all kinds of money behind him, and that is the sort of thing we must guard against. We don't say there should be no drinking on the CBC. We

recognize if CBC is going to do a drama, that today there is lots of drink. We only ask them to use discretion, and particularly when dealing with drink to put it as a disaster and try to give insight and understanding to our cultural humanity that we may be able to get out of this mess we are in in our western world -- particularly on this side of the water.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And it is in this particular light we should look at your recommendation?

MR. LINTON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: On that last point, about the possibility of advertisers or other pressures being brought to bear, you do at several places in your brief mention -- there is one on page 3, where in the middle of the page you say:

"We do feel that advertising must be kept at a minimum and that in no way should it bring pressure to bear on programme or policy."

MR. LINTON: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you stating that as a warning rather than as a protest against something which you say has actually happened? Have you any evidence of it actually happening in Canada?

MR. LINTON: No, we think the situation very good in Canada.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: We have the assurance from a number of stations, and also from CBC, that under no circumstances will they allow a sponsor to

influence a programme. The programme is theirs -- they may sponsor it, but they will not allow them to interfere.

MR. LINTON: Did they tell you they have never been pressured?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I don't know if we asked that question.

THE CHAIRMAN: We did ask one of the private stations.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: That was pressure from owners, because the owner was a newspaper man, and we asked whether he had been pressured by the owner of the newspaper in the matter of news content, and the answer was "Definitely no."

MR. LINTON: Yes.

-

-

-

GG THE CHAIRMAN: At least, I think we can
5 say this, that we have not been able to track down
any evidence of pressure having been exercised.

MR. PORTER: I think Dr. Linton is speaking to a point that has reached reality for you in connection with the Dominion Drama Festival, the encouragement that over-eager people in a set-up can give to a product that is supporting them. I do not know that -- we just want to make that as a warning to say that we are likely to have that unfortunately performance repeated. I think it has been sufficiently discouraged by the public's general and quick reaction, the amount of publicity it got.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that was another activity entirely, of course.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is all, Mr.
Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we wish to thank you for presenting your brief and for coming.

SUBMISSION OF BEN NOBLEMAN (PRIVATE BRIEF)

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a personal brief from Mr. Ben Nobleman; is he here?

Mr. Nobleman, we know you have been following the Commission with interest and your personal brief was only submitted in the required form a day or so ago. The deadline for submitting briefs was the 15th of April and we have made an arrangement with you through Mr. Pelletier, the Secretary, that we will accept your brief and file it as Exhibit 132.

EXHIBIT NO. 132: Brief presented by Mr. Ben Nobleman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would ask you to give a very brief summary of it but not read it.

MR. NOBLEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your courtesy in permitting me to present my views. I think it indicates the Commission is willing to listen to all points of view.

Actually, my brief has five chief points and the first point is a suggestion that the C.B.C. should promote Canadian talent more than it has up to now. My own opinion, after discussing it with a number of people in the industry and private citizens, is that Canadian talent throughout the country should receive more impetus than it has up to now, and this can be done by the C.B.C. indicating that it is willing to listen to talent.

I think one of the answers would be for the C.B.C. to employ talent scouts and send them throughout the country, look through the high-schools, colleges, Little Theatre groups, and present them for auditions, and then you would have a fresh group of talent coming up every year.

There has also been the suggestion in some quarters that there is some sort of nepotism and favouritism at the C.B.C. in regard to the placing of talent.

Also I point out that there are not enough comedy shows on C.B.C. television. I think that is tragic because comedy is an essential part of entertainment and should be given as much time as drama and opera.

I also feel there should be more controversial programmes like "Fighting Words" and a few quiz shows.

As far as the license fee, it is my personal opinion -- and if you gentlemen have been reading the newspapers, it is the opinion of a lot of other people -- that there should be no attempt to impose a license fee with regard to television. This would create more illwill than good and it would be difficult to collect. I think there are a sufficient number of taxes now in the country.

As far as finance, if the C.B.C. is to continue in the television field, it is my view that perhaps an annual statutory grant from Parliament would be advisable. There should also be greater

scrutiny in C.B.C. spending and less waste on services and experimental programmes.

As regards public relations, I think the C.B.C. should improve its public relations department. In recent months it has certainly not made friends and influenced people, and the Stanley Cup Playoffs was an example of that.

I also feel there should be more publicity given to C.B.C. artists in newspapers and magazines and the opinion has been broached that the "star system" is not too popular with the C.B.C. There is no reason why the Canadian public should not be made aware of who the top television artists in the country are.

It is my view that private T.V. should be permitted in the major centres because it is inevitable, sooner or later, and the sooner the better is my view. Competition has always been the life-blood of a system and private T.V. stations, I feel, would improve Canadian television rather than hinder it. Of course, you would have to limit excessive advertising and the private stations would have to do their best to promote Canadian talent as well. I feel there is room in Canada for private and C. B.C. television stations.

Regarding radio, the view that radio is dead is a mistaken one, in my belief. I feel, however, there should be a re-vamping of programme schedules along up-to-date thinking. More emphasis should be placed on public service programmes.

The private stations have done a good job in that field.

I would like to commend such programmes as "Stage Show", "Cross-Section", "Court of Opinions", "Critically Speaking", "Capital Report". One good method of developing talent would be for the radio stations throughout Canada to establish radio workshops where aspiring actors and actresses could obtain useful experience and go on to the professional ranks.

There should be more programmes about current events and politics and City Council meetings should be broadcast.

My summary is that, if the Royal Commission is to obtain a cross-section of public opinion, it should endeavour to obtain the views of ordinary citizens throughout the country. One suggestion would be for the Commission to have night hearings and invite the general public to attend and present oral submissions. In the daytime it appears to me rather difficult for the average person to come down.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am afraid the night-time would be difficult for us; we do our homework for the next day.

MR. NOBLEMAN: I suppose so. The Canadian television system is still in its infancy. It will celebrate its fourth birthday in September, and we have a long way to go before we develop a truly national television system in Canada. There is

room for both private and CBC-TV stations in all major centres and both can flourish and succeed with popular and interesting programmes. This has been the case in radio and can be similarly repeated in television.

Ours must not be a carbon copy of the American system. Canada has a distinct culture of its own and a proud heritage; why not teach our young people something about early life in Canada before and after Confederation? Why not have programmes about the men and women who helped build Canada, about the ten Provinces and the various Canadian political leaders?

Above all, the primary function of Canadian television should be to discover, develop and promote Canadian talent from all parts of Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: For the purpose of the record solely, I take it you live in Toronto?

MR. NOBLEMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your business?

MR. NOBLEMAN: Well, I have been until recently in the public relations field, but I am presently a salesman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you been engaged in the radio or television business, or is this in the nature of a hobby?

MR. NOBLEMAN: It is more or less a hobby, I have no connection, I have never made my financial income from radio or television.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is only for the

record and I want to thank you for coming. It is important to us to have individuals like yourself take an interest, and we appreciate what you told us.

MR. NOBLEMAN: Thank you very much, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, to those faithful souls who have remained throughout, I think we have reached the end of the Toronto hearings. This was originally scheduled as the first hearing in Toronto, but it looks as though we have completed the list here and we will not need to have public hearings in Toronto in the Fall, as we had thought. Some of those who were to have appeared in Toronto will be appearing in Ottawa because they prefer to go there at that time.

We are adjourning the public hearings now, to be resumed as planned at the present time, in St. John's, Newfoundland, on June 18th. We are taking a short break now because we have had quite a heavy schedule over the past six weeks. The Commission will be meeting tomorrow in private and executive sessions, but we will not be meeting here.

This concludes our hearings in Toronto and I wish you, Mr. Pelletier, would thank the authorities at the University for making these premises available to us.

---Whereupon the Commission adjourned, to resume in St. John's, Newfoundland, on Monday, June 18th, 1956.

